UNIVERSITY
OCT 19 1938

The ARYAN PATH

Vol. IX. JULY 1938 No. 7.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
KARMA: THE DOCTRINE OF DEEDS	317
KARMA—	
I. KARMA: WHAT ITS REALIZATION ENTAILS—*By Gerald Heard* ...	319
II. KARMA ACCORDING TO HINDUISM—*By G. R. Malkani*	323
III. KARMA, REINCARNATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL—*By H. P. A. Fausset*	329
IV. SPIRITUAL SHOPKEEPING—*By E. V. Hayes*	332
THE QUEST FOR HAPPINESS—*By Paul E. Johnson*	336
THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS—*By K. N. Dutt*	339
A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION—	
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES—*By Alban G. Widgery* ...	343
MAN AND DEITY IN ORIGINAL BUDDHISM—*By C. A. F. Rhys Davids*... ...	347
NEW BOOKS AND OLD—	
NON-ATTACHED MAN AND FREE SOCIETY—*By Sri Krishna Prem* ...	352
THE FREE MAN IN THE WORLD OF NECESSITY—*By Hugh P. A. Fausset* ...	358
ON ISLAM—*By L. E. Parker*	359
REVIEWS—*By D. G. Londhe; Cecil Roth; Enver Kureishi; Clifford Bax; Laurence Binyon; R. Das; Jack Common; C. Delisle Burns; S. T.; Mark Benney; Philip Henderson; P. T. Raju; S. S. Suryanarayana Shastri and B. P. Howell*	361
ENDS & SAYINGS	371

51, ESPLANADE ROAD - - - - BOMBAY, INDIA.

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India

17, Great Cumberland Place, London W. I.

CONTRIBUTIONS:—Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten, on one side of the paper only, with wide margin, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles only. They are not necessarily in agreement with the views of their contributors, to whom they leave free expression of opinion.

CORRESPONDENCE:—Letters from subscribers and readers are welcome, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the Magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of THE ARYAN PATH.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:—THE ARYAN PATH is published monthly. No subscriptions are accepted for less than twelve months, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All orders should be accompanied by the necessary remittance to the Manager, THE ARYAN PATH. Price: In India, single copy As. 12; per annum Rs. 6. In Europe, single copy 1*s.* 6*d.*; per annum 12*s.* or equivalent. In America, single copy 35 cents; per annum $3; all post free. Back numbers are obtainable on special application.

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT

THIS monthly publication of 16 pages blends the past and the present by reprinting old articles from H. P. B.'s *Theosophist* and *Lucifer*, and W. Q. Judge's *Path*, as well as throwing the light of Theosophy on modern events. All articles are of practical interest.

Principal Contents for June 1938

Robert Crosbie—His Work Goes On
Karmic Visions—*By H. P. B.*
Duty, The Talisman
Constructive Democracy
The Wandering Eye—*By W. Q. Judge*
Approaching the Borderland
To Understand the East
In the Light of Theosophy

Price: As. 2. Annual Subscription: Re. 1, 2*s.*, or 50 cents, post free.

ॐ

Point out the "Way"—however dimly,
and lost among the host—as does the evening
star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. IX JULY 1938 No. 7

KARMA

THE DOCTRINE OF DEEDS

One of the effects of the work of H. P. Blavatsky is to be seen in the large number of Eastern terms, both philosophical and psychological, which have passed into English and other Occidental languages. An examination of such a dictionary as *Webster's New International Dictionary* clearly shows this. One of these terms is Karma. It stands for a whole philosophy of life—simple in its basic formula, but intricate in its practical ramifications. In the East Karma has become a synonym for fate or fatalism, but that it most certainly is not. The simple basis of Karma is well set forth in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians :—

> Be not deceived ; God is not mocked : for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

Though orthodox Christians believe in the miracle of sowing in one field, earth, and reaping in others, heaven and hell, the statement of St. Paul expresses well and accurately the basic idea of the Law of Karma when considered in the light of reincarnation. Accepting the latter teaching many Christians believe in Karma as moral retribution and compensation, translating God as the Law working in the universe. But from the articles published in our pages from time to time it is clear that like its twin, the doctrine of Reincarnation, the Law of Karma is little understood. In this issue we publish half a dozen contributions which raise many important points, and which must provoke thought in, and may even perplex, some of our readers. In a short editorial it is impossible to relieve perplexities provoked or answer issues raised. Here only a few principal ideas can be considered.

The Sanskrit word Karma means "action", and if this meaning were philosophically applied more than one difficulty surrounding the doctrine

would be removed. More generally, however, Karma is taken to be the effect proceeding from an antecedent cause ; and even when it is not taken as destined fate (as it too often is) the aspect of present thought, will and feeling which modifies that past is not well taken into account. The action we do in the present is not to be taken as an effect from a cause which has been a distinct and separate deed in the past. Every act we perform now is the cumulative effect of all we did up to the present. Just as a fruit is not the effect of some distinct and definite action but its evolution has to be traced through leaves, branches and trunk to the very roots of the tree, so are human deeds.

The word Karma—Action—is used in a comprehensive sense in Oriental psycho-philosophy. Not only deeds done but words spoken or feelings felt are also looked upon as works ; ideation and imagination are mind deeds ; resolves are will deeds ; and so on. In India where Karma has come to be looked upon as fixed destiny the importance of mental and moral deeds is not recognised, and so no benefit is derived from the real and practical value of the Law of Karma. No doubt Karma as fatalism is an utterly demoralizing doctrine, but properly understood there is no view of life and human progression so dynamically beneficial as the Law that adjusts and thus compensates.

More than one contributor in this issue speaks of the Karma of the individual and its relationship to the community in which he lives. There is a great deal of confusion about one's responsibility to others who also are working out their Karma. The problem of collective Karma is difficult to comprehend but in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky satisfactory explanations are to be found.

Karma-Nemesis is no more than the (spiritual) dynamical effect of causes produced and forces awakened into activity by our own actions. It is a law of occult dynamics that " a given amount of energy expended on the spiritual or astral plane is productive of far greater results than the same amount expended on the physical objective plane of existence ".

Were no man to hurt his brother, Karma-Nemesis would have neither cause to work for, nor weapons to act through. It is the constant presence in our midst of every element of strife and opposition, and the division of races, nations, tribes, societies and individuals into Cains and Abels, wolves and lambs, that is the chief cause of the " ways of Providence ".

This state will last till man's spiritual intuitions are fully opened, which will not happen before we fairly cast off our thick coats of matter ; until we begin acting from *within*, instead of ever following impulses from *without* ; namely, those produced by our physical senses and gross selfish body. Until then the only palliative to the evils of life is union and harmony—a Brotherhood IN ACTU, and *altruism* not simply in name. The suppression of one single bad *cause* will suppress not one, but a variety of bad effects. And if a Brotherhood or even a number of Brotherhoods may not be able to prevent nations from occasionally cutting each other's throats—still unity in thought and action, and philosophical research into the mysteries of being, will always prevent some, while trying to comprehend that which has hitherto remained to them a riddle, from creating additional causes in a world already so full of woe and evil.

—*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I.

To help the reader catch a glimpse of this important and practical doctrine we close this number with a few apt quotations.

KARMA

I

KARMA : WHAT ITS REALIZATION ENTAILS

There has, perhaps, been no time in human history when the Doctrine of the Deed was so needed. Yet it must also be recognised that there was seldom a time when such masses of humanity were behaving as though Karma was only a story with which to frighten children. Leaders and led are acting with a complete irresponsibility quite impossible to those who realize that as a man sows so shall he reap, and that the deed once done, its consequences are inescapable. We must then first ask why such a common sense doctrine is apparently neglected by the generation which asserts that it is practical. The answer to that question gives us insight into our age. It will also show us how we might emerge from our international and social anarchy, and discover a new order.

World religion is to-day undergoing its second æonic revolution. The first religious revolution was the change over from a religion which was primarily social to one which was primarily individual. At the present time religion is once again changing, changing back from being individualistic to becoming again social. The convulsive efforts of the totalitarian states, the bewilderment of the democracies, are symptoms of the same thing : man has discovered that he cannot live as an individual and is seeking for a larger life in which to blend and fulfil himself. This change affects radically our whole attitude toward the Doctrine of the Deed. In the early, " integral " societies, responsibility was general, and could not be thought of otherwise—it was collective and complete. There was no life but the common life. In such a society Karma would be self-evident. There could be no debts or credits contracted outside the community, every act of its constituents entered into its balances, every loss and mistake had to be remedied by an equal gain and rightness. There was no escaping consequences, because the common life of which all were part, went on for ever. When, however, these primal integrated societies began to disintegrate, their constituents could only seek to arrive at personal and private settlements with the divine law. In the language of all the prophetic teachers of the seventh and eighth centuries B.C., teachers who extend from China to South Italy, each man must make his own settlement with Reality. This doctrine led to Karma becoming a personal and private concern. " No man may make agreement for his brother " : " The doctrines of vicarious merit and grace are superstitions " : " Each man saves himself or loses himself " : such sayings are the commonplaces of the great reforms which swept over the old collectivist religions. This stress, partial though it be, was at the time necessary. The old religions had mostly ceased to teach a true conception of Karma.

Indeed these elderly foundations were already individualized without knowing it, for their doctrines of Grace no longer taught collective responsibility but that by depending on a wholly alien being the debtor's trespass would be cancelled. Such teaching is highly dangerous, not only to the individual but to society. It was, then, a social revolution which compelled a recasting of responsibility in individual terms. Personal survival after death had to be brought forward to take the place of the eternal life of the community. This new sanction for moral conduct was, however, a makeshift. First, it developed what Saint Jerome calls complacently "holy selfishness", and then because this was essentially false, the belief itself began to crumble.

These are the reasons tending in our time to renew the search for a collective instead of a private responsibility. Aiding this wish are the findings of modern science—that we are only partially individuals. The question put to Jesus of Nazareth when a blind man was brought to him, "Did this man sin, or his parents?" is a question which increasingly concerns all the sciences of life. We realize as an empirical fact that no one can say, "I discharge my whole liability by paying out of merits I solely earned, all the debts I personally contracted." It was partly because the doctrine of Karma has been said by some so to teach, that it has been discarded by many as being both unsocial and untrue. Those who are accustomed to reflect upon the Self, know that the above proposition is not necessarily inaccurate if the Self is understood in its immense ramifications. To the casual, hurried reader of the West, however, such a statement seemed to show Karma to be a doctrine unfounded and unworthy.

The re-statement of the doctrine therefore deserves some care, for without it there can be no true morality. Before, however, we can render it in our contemporary vernacular, we must examine a little more closely our actual position at the present moment. We are, by our thinking, driven to the conclusion that we are not wholly individuals. That our feelings confirm the findings of our thought is proved by the desperate efforts men are now making everywhere to find their full and satisfying being in a nation or a race. Science also shows us that we are not separate persons who can set sure bounds to our responsibilities, but, rather, are nodes where the threads of innumerable heredities cross for a moment before again passing out to make fresh nexus. This position, however, is far from satisfactory, for although it indicates that we all belong to a larger life than that of our physical bodies and even that we have a blind craving to live in and feel that life, it does not show us how to attain to such a condition. Neither mechanistic science nor the teachings of the dictators give a way of life which can be said to lead to a higher morality among men. Indeed the contrary is so much the fact that to-day many faced with our social chaos are wishing to flee life and can hardly escape complete despair.

We need not, however, give up hope. If we persevere in our enquiry, we shall discover the missing links which are needed to make a dynamic morality of our present knowledge.

What we require is a direct sense of our kinship with all life. For this sense would give driving force to the intellectual proposition of Western science that all life is one, and it would also give a real and sufficient basis of loyalty in place of the false and fatal (because narrow and exclusive) loyalties urged by the dictatorships. What is befalling us today (and although painful, it is hopeful) is that we are feeling our way back to organic society—to a living relationship with our fellows (and through that to all life)—a relationship in which alone we can have an adequate moral life. Individualised morality has done its part and served its turn. We are, however, in a painful state of transition because though most of us now know what we don't want, few as yet can see clearly enough to know what we do want. What we need if we are to take the next step, is that direct experience of our unlimited social liability and this is only possible when we have found a way of living not based on the cash nexus, not based on mutual self-interest, but on an awareness of a common life, an awareness as vivid as the consciousness of self. This is not a vague aspiration. There is now ample evidence of how essentially therapeutic the simplest intentional-social pattern can be. Practical sociology has proved that most criminals will recover if they can be placed in a community where they cannot fail to see the social consequences of their acts. With such experience Karma becomes a doctrine which simply states as a general law that of which every one has his own personal knowledge. As such a group life is continued, it grows in integration and aim. Each constituent becomes aware that he lives because he is part of a general eternal life. He sees that only by so living in that constant knowledge will he come at last to be an undivided part of that eternal, conflictless Being.

That desire for union with the One is the common experience of all seekers for fundamental order and peace in their spirits. Some Western authors, however, for example the great Dr. Schweitzer in his interesting essay on Indian thought, have said they find here a serious ethical obstacle. Though they cannot avoid the conclusion that the mystical attitude and activity toward life is the only true outlook and approach, they feel that it must lead to a-social conduct. This difficulty is mistaken but all too common. We can try to rebut it by saying that the acceptance of being part of life demands of man the highest social behaviour ; behaviour which alone is free of the unfortunate consequences of Western and all individualistic morality ; that individualistic altruism is really egotism : I do good to others to benefit my highest, irreducible self. This, however, is argument, not experience. Men, and among them some of the best, will continue to think that the devoted search for union with the One, and even the doctrine of Karma, are only " escapes " whereby thinker and saint leave the world in its ignorance and squalor, unless they can be given not merely argument but actual experience of the Karmic, organic way of living.

The doctrine of Karma therefore to-day prompts us, compels us to the

most active social living, because it not only tells us to find our fulfilment in our fellows ; it goes, and to-day must go, much further. To-day it tells us that if we are to live up to what we know, we must not merely keep the present society going, we must start reconstructing it in such a clearly patterned form, in such a design for living that in it all, from the simplest to the most advanced and proficient, may have direct experience that they are living a life of unlimited liability, a life of union which expands naturally and fully, beyond the limits of the individual life and ego.

That, then, is what the doctrine of Karma to-day compels us to do : to act more creatively than any other belief can compel us to act. And these are not vague words, for unless we so act we shall undoubtedly perish ; for if we do not make for men a collective way of life, they will make for themselves a collective way of death. One thing is certain : the old individualism is over and no one now can pursue his fate, treating the world as something indifferent. " We must all hang together or all hang separately." What happened during the epoch of individual salvation was that the engine (the saint) became uncoupled and went ahead, while the carriages, our ordinary selves, either stayed where we were or slipped backward. We have to-day to re-couple the train to its true engines. Otherwise false tractors are ready to drag it over the precipice. In practical words that means simply the building up once again of a society which is organic, just as the physical body is organic. Yesterday the world lacked leaders. To-day it is full of blind leaders of the blind, one of the most powerful and active of whom actually has spoken of himself as a sleepwalker. Against these leader-seers who see only illusion we must put true leader-seers. Briefly this means building up a hieratic society against a militaristic society. The individualised democracies are helpless against the organised societies even when these are organised on a false basis and pattern. The most mistaken inspiration, as a matter of brutal fact, is more effective than the most lucid rationalism. The only valid answer to the dictatorial state is the divine society. We have no time to use vague circumlocutions. Karma, both as a doctrine and as a fact ; both as an intellectual proposition and also as the causative force working in our history, to-day compels us to set up once more a caste-patterned organic society.

Just as the physical body has a graded order of organs working co-operatively, so we must have a social body, graded from the eyes which see to the hands which shape. Caste only collapsed because the position of seer was too often held by those who were blind. If, believing in Karma and the unlimited liability of each to all and all to each, we frame a truly organic society we shall find that such a society will take on the shape of a dynamic caste order : seers, the eyes of the body at the head ; administrators, the hands ; fine craftsmen, the muscles of the body ; contented servants, the feet. Such an arrangement is inevitable. Armies which have to organise not according to rights but according to realities have such an order :—General, staff officer, non-commissioned officer and private. The

river of life is spanned by a bridge of never less than four piers. That is to say, types of consciousness which incarnate range between the seer and the routineer. He who denies this fact contradicts life. It may be cruel but it is actual. How then are we to eliminate the cruelty while facing the truth ? Liberal, individualised Democracy would not face the truth : dictatorial, militaristic Dictatorship mocks at the cruelty ; only an organic caste system can face the truth and yet remove from it the sting of cruelty. In the hieratic-dynamic caste society, based on a full realization of Karma, there is both the facing of the facts of life and also a complete elimination of cruelty. Justice and Mercy kiss one another. For here we have a society where the wisest can see and inspire, and the three orders of the practical are all led to carry on according to their gifts. The vision of those at the head shows that the whole body politic is one, and those who now serve on the word of a just and inspired authority will in turn come to direct, open vision. Working Faith ends in sight. Here are provided the patience and the selflessness without which there can be no social or physical fruition. Private virtue without public pattern is stultified. Public pattern without private virtue is helpless.

This, of course, is not to revive the old decadent form of caste. Each man must be given the position to which he is called by his manifest gift and by his devotion to its development. If he cannot sustain his rank, he must sink to his inherent level. Those at the head—the seers—must be free of possessions : the Eye sees all and possesses itself of nothing. Further, as Manu knew, the Eye does not even shape. It reports reality, and the hands then act according to the Eyes' finding. Such, then, is the living social pattern, the highest world-social morality which mankind must find or perish. And this organic life, this extension of unlimited liability to all mankind, finds its inherent sanction in its constant experience of the Doctrine of the Deed—Karma.

GERALD HEARD

II

KARMA ACCORDING TO HINDUISM

It is a distinguishing feature of Hinduism that it cannot be identified with any particular doctrine or set of beliefs. There are all levels of thought present in it at the same time. Outsiders may think this a a defect. In reality, it leaves the Hindu free to adjust his faith to the growing demands of his reason and his experience. His faith is simply to him a starting point. As his experience grows, his faith also grows. The faith is merely a symbol of his experience. The ultimate truth is not a symbol. It is a direct intuition of reality. It is an experience which cannot be symbolised, and which, therefore, cannot be formulated into a set of beliefs. All doubts and questions are here set at rest. The truth is seen ;

it cannot be spoken.

Certain doctrines are held within Hinduism, not because they are the last word of truth. They are held because they answer certain questions most satisfactorily. Those questions themselves may not be legitimate. They proceed on certain assumptions which may be, in the last analysis, unjustified. But if we accept the assumptions, the question is inevitable. So too is the answer within the framework of those assumptions. The answer then is conditionally true. It would be unconditionally true, when no unproved or doubtful assumptions are admitted and when truth evidences itself.

The doctrine of Karma is one such doctrine. It is the best explanation of certain ethical facts. It introduces law and order within moral life. The individual is made responsible for all he is and all he does. No outside power can help him. There are no miracles in morals. The individual must work his way, in patience and perseverance, in a process of life which goes beyond the limits of the present life of the body. He cannot shift his burden on to some one else, or enjoy the fruits of others' labours. As he sows, so shall he reap. This is the law. There is no escape from it.

A series of objections can be raised against this view.

It may be argued that this involves a dualistic metaphysics. We have to conceive the soul as separate from the body. But is this true? The soul in the body cannot be found. The very notion of it is very crude. We think of the soul materialistically. We think of it as some substance, however subtle and attenuated, enclosed within the body like a thing put away within a box. This does not appear to be true. In what sense then can the soul be said to throw off its body or to change it as a person changes his clothes? Transmigration of the soul is like migration of a bird imprisoned within a cage. Where is the evidence of such a soul?

We do not propose to answer this objection directly. It is best answered by considering the alternatives to dualism. Psychical research indeed may be said to have proved the survival of an intelligent entity, something which may rightly be called the soul, when the associated body has fallen off and ceased to function as the vehicle of any intelligence. But even this more or less direct evidence cannot solve the metaphysical difficulty. What is the nature of that which goes from body to body? Can it be wholly and entirely immaterial? We have to admit, as Hinduism admits, that any definition of materiality must embrace all that can occupy space, all that can enter a physical body or leave it. The soul, according to this definition, would be material. Yet what are the alternatives to the reality of such a soul?

We hold that the distinction of the soul from the body is a necessary stage in our thought. But it is only a stage. It is not the final truth. There are thinkers who hold that there is no soul, and that consciousness is only an epiphenomenon of the body. There are others, who although not professing to be materialists, still think that the relation of the soul to the body is quite organic

and that consciousness can neither function nor continue to have any kind of being apart from the physical body. But this is a distinction without a difference. If the relation is organic, then the disintegration of the body must mean the disintegration of the intelligence associated with that body. What more does a materialistic interpretation of reality need ? There is no intelligence apart from the body, and when the body ends the intelligence ends also. There are reasons for holding that materialism is inconsistent with facts and self-contradictory. It is not the true interpretation of reality. But if that is so, we have to admit that consciousness can and does exist in its own right, and that with the disintegration of the body the intelligence that was the individual does not cease to exist.

The only other alternative to dualism of the soul and the body is monism at the other end, or the monism of the spirit. It is found in the system of thought known as Advaitism. It is a complete philosophy by itself, into the details of which we cannot here enter. Suffice it to say, that it extends the notion of the body and gives a new interpretation of the relation of consciousness to the body. The sphere of the unintelligent is not merely the physical body. It includes the spheres of biology and of psychology. Life, mind, intellect, in short everything that we can analyse out in the entire being that is the individual, is merely a sheath, a body, and so unintelligent. It is a hard notion for a Westerner who identifies consciousness, and so the ultimate principle of intelligence, with the mind taken in a very general sense. According to Advaitism, mind is *jada*. It is in itself unintelligent. The true principle of intelligence is beyond it. The mind is part of the subtle body. It is this body which at death may be said to leave the physical body and to transmigrate. And then what is the relation of the body, understood in this wider sense, to the ultimate principle of intelligence or the *ātman* as it is called ? The *ātman*, our true self, is not enclosed in the body. It is truer to say that the body is *in the soul* rather than that the soul is in the body. For the soul occupies no space and no time. The relation of the body to the soul or the *ātman* thus understood is not a real relation. We may be said to have a real relation between two entities which are both finite, and so distinct either spatially, or temporally or characteristically. The *ātman* has no such limitation. How then can it sustain any relation to aught else ? The only relation between the *ātman* and the body is what is technically called " false identification ". The consequences of this view are very wide, and go much beyond the Karmic law. The soul does not die, the soul does not go anywhere. We are where we are, eternally. What happens at death is that the knot of identification with this particular physical body is broken. The knot with the subtle body remains. That knot makes us appear as transmigrating. It is false ultimately that we are in this body or that we leave this body, and it is false ultimately that we transmigrate. But if we are not prepared to go so far because of certain inherent prejudices, a

dualistic metaphysics, which is the basis of the Karmic law, is unavoidable.

Another objection which may be raised against the law of Karma is as follows. It may be argued that our individuality is not ultimately real. Both physically and mentally we are part of a larger whole. We are persons and individuals only in the superficial layers of consciousness. In the deeper layers of it " we seem to emerge into a comprehensive impersonal consciousness out of which all our individual personalities are thrust, as islands out of an underlying land mass are thrust above sea-level ".[1] If this is true, there is no individual Karma as distinct from the social Karma. Individual survival and individual salvation do not matter. In fact, to aim at these is immoral. The individual cannot be saved, unless all life is saved. Our individualism is a phase. Our salvation lies in uniting ourselves consciously to all life and basing our action upon this knowledge. We must realize that we lead a life of unlimited liability.

I cannot say to the deformed beggar : " So you earned and so you are." Neither he nor I have ever been, are now, or will ever be, absolute individuals. We earn for each other both evil and good, and are earned for. My thought and feeling is not mine but came from others, and I can give to others.[2]

It appears to us that this view is based upon an inadequate appreciation of the fact of our individuality. I may appear to give and I may appear to receive. I may appear to share in a common life. But am I nothing but a temporary individuation out of the whole ? If that were so, I could not exist in my own right. I could not make any *contribution* to common life and make it richer. I could not be a creator who could lift the common stock as well as depress it. Either then the individual has real responsibility, in which case his individuality cannot be illusory, or he is merely an offshoot, a chance product, of a whole which completely transcends him, determines him and keeps him in his place. To talk of responsibility, or of joint responsibility or common Karma under these circumstances is as much as to say that the parts of a machine can take the place of the maker of the machine. The law of Karma demands that the individual is responsible for himself alone. He cannot be made responsible for the rest of life.

But then what would be the ethical implications of this view ? Are we to suppose that each individual is merely concerned to save himself, and that there can be no place for altruism in his life ? We hold that altruism is not ruled out, but it is altruism that is fully consistent with the greater good of the individual himself. It is a false altruism according to which the individual is required to subordinate his good to the good of others. The good of others as such and at the expense of the good of one's own self cannot, psychologically, be a goal for any one. Altruism can only be a part of a plan of life in which I realise my own highest good. But is this not

[1] *The Third Morality* by GERALD HEARD, p. 161.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

"holy selfishness" again, the bane of an anthropomorphic view of life? Here we have another characteristic Hindu doctrine.

Individual Karma may have the touch of selfishness; but the ultimate destiny of the individual is nothing less than to break Karma and get out of it. On the plane of action, we can truly say that as a man sows so shall he reap. But we can never reach the goal through action alone. We may rise higher and higher, but we can never come to the end. To come to the end, Karma must cease and man be released from transmigratory existence. *How will Karma cease? It will not cease through itself. It will not cease through another Karma. It will only cease through Self-Knowledge or through the knowledge of unity.* This unity is not an empirical fact known through an analysis of the facts of common experience studied by the various sciences. So far as empirical fact goes, difference is irreducible. It is a non-empirical unity realised only at the highest level of consciousness. It is not a unity in the sense in which we say all life is one. It is not a unity in the sense in which we say we are parts of an organism, the society. It is not a unity in the sense in which we say that, in the deeper layers of our consciousness, our individuality lapses and we are united to all life. In the deeper layers of consciousness there are still individual memories, individual potencies and individual propensities. We are one only in that consciousness which at all levels *reveals* the separateness and the individuality of our embodied existence in its widest sense. This unity is not to be won through co-operative action. It is not to be won at all. It is an eternal fact to be known. When it is known, there is no scope for ethics left. Our individuality, and so the individuality of others, is simply illusory. All bonds fall off, and the individual is released from the shell of his individuality. There is nothing left for him to be realised through action; for all action is individualistic; it is governed by the Karmic law. The realisation of the self as the universal self is the highest destiny of the individual. But this is no private or selfish gain. For the individual has completely shed his separateness, his otherness, his privacy. These are illusory to him. The doctrine of Karma has its necessary complement in the doctrine of knowledge. It is truth that shall make you free, not action.

A third objection against the Karmic law is that if it is true then Karma can never begin. What we are at a particular moment of time is what we have made ourselves in earlier time. We can never be said to have begun absolutely. If we can be said to have begun absolutely in the limitless past, why not suppose that we can begin with this life itself? If Karma can be begun, then at that very point Karma ceases to be true. The first Karma becomes absolutely free and undetermined. Why place it unnecessarily in the distant past? And then, can there be an end of Karma? That too is not possible. If what we sow we reap, there will never come a time when we shall not need to have to sow at all. All action leads to certain re-

sults. But those results can only be impermanent. The process would never end. There will never come a time when we shall be free from Karma, free from the law. What then is the prospect which the law of Karma opens to the individual? What is the beginning and what is the end? Is our life part of a machine which works inexorably without beginning and without end? The answer to this is that Karma has indeed no beginning. If the soul is never created, it cannot also have a history which begins in time. But there is a sense in which Karma can have an end. It can have an end when the individual realises the illusory character of his individuality, when he sees that he is not part of any cosmic process, that he does not really transmigrate, and that he is timeless, free, without blemish, and eternally fulfilled in himself. The cosmic process is real to him only so long as he has identified himself with the body or the not-self. But when this false identification is broken, he can look on his so-called past history of what is alien to him. He will cease to identify himself with his historical existence, and with such absolute detachment his Karma will have ceased for ever.

One more objection may here be considered. It may be argued that the law of Karma seems to undermine something of finer quality in our moral life. If the individual is wholly responsible for what he makes himself, if he finds himself in the grip of an inexorable law, he can expect no aid in any quarter. There can be no such thing as grace of God for him. The individual must work alone for himself for what he is worth. No one can help him. This is by no means encouraging to a man who is keenly conscious of his frailties. Instead of a benevolent theism, we have a godless and in a sense a soulless universe in which each individual must work out his individual destiny.

We conclude that we cannot escape the law of Karma. But it is a law which only governs our empirical existence. When we see the face of reality, a reality which is timeless, which does not grow or diminish, which has no individuated being, and which sums up all our aspirations, the law of Karma ceases to be true. The ultimate reality is an eternally accomplished fact. It is beyond the law.

G. R. MALKANI

III

KARMA, REINCARNATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Doctrines are apt to harden into dogmas and against this process of petrification the questioning even of the ignorant may be of service, if it is directed not towards destroying what is true in doctrine, but towards discovering a deeper meaning in it.

The doctrines of Reincarnation and of Karma have been so long and widely accepted in the East and enable us to explain so many things which Christianity for example leaves entirely unexplained, that we are apt to forget that they can only have truth for us in the degree that we make them real in our experience. For most of us whose inward vision is not opened to our past, Reincarnation is not a revealed truth, but a possible hypothesis. Re-birth is a revealed truth ; for we experience it every day and more intensely in certain crises in our life. But whatever intimations of previous existence we may have (and many have none), we have no certainty, for example, that we lived before on this earth and not on some other planet where we might also have acquired the Karma which we are working out here. I am not, however, concerned with such fruitless speculations, but rather with the suggestion that in the doctrine of Reincarnation individuality tends to be stressed too much.

We can believe that behind every painful circumstance there is a cause or a train of causes without imputing total responsibility for it to the individual who suffers most under it. Few contemplating the pronounced differences in human character and in what we might call the spiritual age of people can doubt that behind each individual born into the world there is a line of development, a genealogy of experience, varying in length and complexity. We are manifestly not all born into this world at the same stage of growth. Some are more spiritually mature than others, some more oppressed, baffled or afflicted. This is explained by those who accept[1] the doctrine of Reincarnation by the number of lives which the individual has previously spent on earth and the degree to which he has profited by them.

If we were absolute individuals, it would be a quite satisfying explanation. But in fact we are inseparably parts of a whole, of a family, a social group, a nation, of all humanity. To our direct ancestors we owe our bodies and to some extent the physical circumstances under which we live. From them we inherit tendencies to physical strength or weakness which our own conduct of life can only modify to some extent, and in the case of the most crippling disabilities, hardly at all. It may well be true that each of us is inevitably drawn to the parents, the body and the physical environment which we have earned in previous existences and which is exactly suited to our spiritual needs in this one. But if we share our bodily Karma with a host of others who culminated in our parents, may not the more interior Karma of our character and moral

[1] Not always.—Eds.

disposition come to us through corresponding lines of spiritual descent? May we not, as esoteric science has been known to affirm, possess spiritual as well as earthly parents, and a family in the unseen world with which we are far more closely linked than with our earthly family in the working out of a common destiny? If this is so, the conditions into which we are born on earth, our degree of spiritual maturity or immaturity and our potentialities for good or evil may be as much a family as an individual inheritance. And even those memories of previous existence, to which some have testified, may be reflections of earlier experiences on the line of our descent, comparable to the features of some ancestor which reappear in the face of some quite distant descendant.

We have tended so much to see the individual in separation from the whole to which he belongs that the suggestion that each of us may be enjoying the rewards of others' virtue and suffering the penalties of others' errors, however closely these others may be linked with us in the family of life, may strike many as contrary to justice. Yet the true self transcends so far our narrow conception of exclusive individuality that it is possible to reconcile a belief in individual responsibility for our own Karma with a conviction that our destiny is as much an expression of forces of which we are the heirs as the result of actions which we personally committed in past lives.

That every generation inherits its circumstances and to some extent its capacities from its predecessors, while being no less responsible for its own behaviour, is obvious. And this general law of succession and interdependence, which finds particular expression in the genealogy of families, nations and races, must surely extend to the super-physical planes. Those planes, we are told and it is reasonable to believe, contain provision for every state of being from the least to the most evolved. And we shall inevitably find ourselves after death on that plane which reflects our state, which, indeed, *is* our state. But we shall not find ourselves there alone. Behind us and with us and beyond us will be others whose struggle to ascend to the planes of perfect emancipation is as much our struggle as ours is theirs. Through our advance those who are also ourselves by ties of mysterious relationship will be helped to advance, while we in our turn shall be aided by the light that comes to us from those who are spiritually our elder brothers. And this process of mutual dependence and collaboration in the redemption of an individual and a composite self is, I feel sure, at work in us now and can be quickened in the degree that we realize its significance. For with a vision extended into the unseen world we can identify ourselves with all that is creative in our line of descent, while by acts of willing sacrifice we can suffer in our persons some of the darkness which has accumulated there through the negative acts of our spiritual ancestors and by the power of goodness and forgiveness help to transmute it into light. And we are surely strengthened to undertake this great creative labour if we realize that in our efforts to overcome evil with good we are not striving merely

to reverse something in ourselves, that we are members of one family whose intertwining branches, stretching out over earth, reach into unseen worlds and that there is no single thought or act of ours which is not felt within it.

This sense of intimate association, too, in the adventure and the trials of life is the best antidote alike to a morbid consciousness of personal sin and a selfish pursuit of self-perfection. For while the sense of sin must always remain until the divided ego has returned to unity, the recognition that it is a common and a shared burden in itself reduces our sense of separateness. So, too, does the knowledge that there can be no self-perfection in which the whole of which we are a part does not participate and that what little we achieve in growth towards real selfhood has been also in a profoundly actual sense achieved for us. Such a realization of the super-individual nature both of sinful egoism and of perfect selfhood will not lessen our personal efforts to outgrow the one and grow into the other. But it will save us from becoming wrongly self-engrossed in those efforts.

The problem of suffering, too, will be less insoluble. That the wicked should seem to prosper and the righteous be afflicted has always been hard to explain and justify. And an abandonment of merely individualistic or legal standards of justice is an essential preliminary to any understanding of the problem. Only then are we in a condition to perceive the creative value of suffering and to appraise from within the worthlessness of what the world considers prosperity. And here again the conventional interpreter of the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation tends, I feel, to explain suffering too neatly and narrowly in individualistic terms. According to him all suffering is the fruit of private error in this or previous lives. He would doubtless admit that there are national and even racial Karmas, but these, too, he would explain as the sum of the Karmas of the individuals composing the nation or race. And even of the millions who suffered anguish and death in the Great War he would probably hold that each had earned that particular fate by his own conduct in past lives.

This is surely too narrowly individual an application of the law of cause and effect. Not only does it fail to allow sufficiently for the fact that we are in very truth members one of another, but it takes from the creative mystery that element of free giving, transcending a merely logical balance of reward and punishment, which our deepest experience tells us is divinely immanent in things. We grow by giving and receiving, not by piling up merit for ourselves. If we could not give to others beyond their strictly logical deserts, we could not receive the divine grace which is infinitely beyond our logical deserts. According to those who interpret the doctrine of Karma most strictly no one can help to redeem another's Karma. Every grain that a man has sown he must reap himself. And of the particular grains that he himself has sown this may well be true. But the harvest a man reaps, as I have suggested, may not be exclusively his own and just as we share in and suf-

fer through the Karmas of others, so we could not redeem our own without helping to redeem theirs. In the affairs of ordinary human life and even in the natural world this principle of mutual help is apparent. Each doubtless has his own predetermined cross to bear, but he can be aided in the bearing of it and the rigid law of cause and effect to that extent modified by the deeper creative law of charity. Why then should the possibility of vicarious suffering be irreconcilable with a true conception of Karma ?

As the strong can aid the weak in the stress of some physical crisis, so surely may the spiritually strong by free acts of love take upon them some of the burden under which those linked with them are toiling, thereby helping them to find new strength of their own and to go forward, as they could not otherwise have done, to relieve in turn the burden of others. In this labour of love we work, as I have suggested, not only with those who are visibly linked with us in our earthly life, but with a vast family both here and in the unseen world of which we can but faintly divine the dimensions. If we could see the number of those who with us are struggling through darkness towards light and who depend on our fidelity to the light to hold their own in the conflict of opposed forces or to emerge from an abyss, our determination to fail less often in our own endeavour would be strengthened. And by the same vision we should see suffering, too, in a truer light, see it, in fact, less as a punishment than as a privilege whereby we pass beyond the negative conflict of pain and pleasure, beyond the power, too, of the Karmic law, to grow into the very heart of being. Into the mystery of suffering, however, there is not space to enter now. It is enough if I have suggested that behind the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation there may be more of mystery than those who reduce them to neat formulas for explaining the inequalities of life have allowed.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

IV

SPIRITUAL SHOPKEEPING

There are certain fundamental ideas that once grasped can never be forgotten. Karma is one of these—the Law of Cause and Effect, of Ceaseless Readjustment, which underlies all true philosophy. But Man is something more than a creature of any Law, however fundamental and far-reaching ; he is, as Man, a centre of unfolding self-consciousness. This unfolding, at first, is towards complexity, towards possessiveness, towards ego-self-assertion. And during this period of unfolding, to believe in the Law of Karma is to believe fully in Rewards and Punishments, to seek consolation in the fact that every injury done to oneself must have its injurious effect upon the one who injures ; that those who do not live

up to one's own standard of morality and right behaviour must find in Nature and the Powers behind Nature stern schoolmasters ready to wield the birch. If one does right, is unselfish, observes some certain code of ethics, suffers loss through integrity or through loyalty, then the Law will reward that praiseworthy individual.

The trouble is that the Law does appear to work that way. Not always, of course—so that much of our reward and others' punishment has to be held over until another life, here or in some other realm of consciousness. But that effect must follow cause, that in the sphere of ethical behaviour Nature does seem, roughly speaking, to reward the virtuous and to bring retribution on the wicked, can hardly be denied save by the shallow thinker. If Man were but body and soul it would be unnecessary to travel farther ; we could rest content with this primitive conception of Karma, watching the other man flounder as the result of wrongdoing and selfishness, and ourselves reaping the good effects of our righteousness—here, partially ; the rest, later. But there is the Spirit in Man to take into account—the Spiritual Consciousness, which without losing its Selfhood can—and does—eventually transcend the petty self with its shopkeeping notions, its anxiety to have every wrong to itself adjusted, to receive its due for what it performs, suffers and sacrifices.

This second stage is so different from the preceding stage of grasping, appropriation and rough-and-ready justice, that the man experiencing it must take a different view of the laws that govern Nature's workings. Karma remains fundamental ; none the less, to the second stage of unfolding consciousness, it appears so different that it almost becomes a new Law transcending Karma—as it indeed transcends the old conceptions of the clutching, appropriating self. The experience of life, plus the heightening of consciousness itself, alone can bring about the deepening sense of what Retribution is, and how little we ought to expect Reward or Punishment in the old crude sense.

Someone injures me ; as a well-known example, a friend to whom I have shewn every love and consideration, betrays and abandons me. My first instinct is secretly to cry upon the Powers that administer the Law to avenge me. Furtively, I ask for justice ; if not, it is because I am persuaded that it is bound to happen, and my prayer is unnecessary. It must be so, I tell myself. How beautifully unselfish I was in all my dealings with this delinquent friend ! How much I gave up ! How completely I considered him first and myself second, if at all. How patient I was, and how pure my affection ! On the other side, how callous was his treatment of me, with what lack of appreciation he accepted of my best, and with what cold seeing he witnessed my devotion ! And in the final issue, how cruel were his betrayal and his misrepresentation ! I must be recompensed ! If I am still in the shopkeeping stage of spiritual life, I wait expectantly for my reward and his bitter regret. I wait in vain. I can see no reward attached to any of my services in the old days of friendship ; I may even feel the loss of him so keenly that it looks as if I were

being punished, and as though no other friend could take his place to bring some consolation. And the defaulting friend goes on merrily, forgetting me, or remembering me only to renew his misstatements and his hard antagonism ; with other friends, other interests, well content.

So, in sheer necessity, for my comfort, I create a Karmic future, a hell for him on the other side of death or centuries hence upon this planet, according to my philosophy, and a heaven for myself...without him. I deceive myself, *the moment I touch the second stage of the unfolding of my consciousness*, if I allow this idea of Reward and Punishment to maintain its grip ; if, like a hurt child, I want to hit out with my fists. As long as I am grasping, hoping, becoming rich by snatching, a spiritual octopus, then this illusionary idea of Reward and Punishment can appear real and may even assist my growth. But when I am becoming rich in myself ; when from within I am sending out the perfume of my real self, it will be agony to permit this crudity to occupy my mind.

It has been said that the story of Christ may not be historically true. But psychologically it is true ; it is the presentation of how a Perfect Man reacts to all the circumstances of life. Here is a Perfect Man, betrayed, abandoned, slandered, mocked, monstrously treated. What does he say ? " Forgive them ; they know not what they do." Are we to say that those words were mere movements of the lips ; mere pose ? What ! From a man in his agony ? Incredible ! They represent the cry forced from the soul that has achieved the idea torn out of the spiritual texture of the Man horribly suffering. They assert complete abandonment of all notions of Reward and Punishment. For the simple reason : " They know not what they do."

Why do we ask that another shall be punished—and so often ask in vain ? In the same spirit as some people demand floggings for certain criminals and derive sadist pleasure when such a flogging is administered. But the law that sanctions flogging and hanging is purely arbitrary ; we know that. We have no right to extend our revenge urge into the realms of spiritual Law, unchanging and true. What shall we do about our injuries, our sufferings and other people's selfishness and cruelty ? In the second stage of unfolding consciousness, new ideas will present themselves, in which we shall find new understanding of life.

One is, that in this higher stage love is eternal, and the unity, not only theoretically with all, but especially with the beloved, will be most potent. To see your friend punished is to ask punishment for yourself ; why add to your pain ? If Christ on His Cross knew that Judas had hanged himself, He suffered more in that than in His own torment. In the appropriating stage of your inner life, while you are greedily snatching, then indeed you can say : " That old-time friend of mine—now my friend no longer—well deserves what has happened to him. See how badly he treated me ! I hope it will teach him a lesson." You simply cannot say it in the further stage of growth from within—without appropriation. No, if a prophet came to you, a soothsayer, and said :

"This friend of yours is going to suffer for his treatment of you ; I can read it in the stars, or in some book of fate" ; you would cry, "It must not be ! I have agonised enough for his sake ; I cannot endure any more." Or your faithless friend goes on, careless and apparently happy without you. You are desperately lonely, cruelly hurt. Compensation for you ? How can there be, in wishing punishment for one you still love but who prefers to be without you ? No, love and suffering are woven together ; why seek to separate them ? Not to suffer keenly means that one cannot really love. Take your love and your suffering in the same consecrated chalice, as a priest mingles wine and water in the Communion Cup ; it is the Very Blood of Life itself ; and your soul needs the mingling that it may grow.

Another idea born in the spiritually awakening heart is that none hurts us save ourselves. If you could look into the mind of your defaulting friend, you might be surprised to find how truly he believes all that he says against you ; how wearied of your affection he became, and how binding he discovered your love to be. He struck out in self-defence ; in the effort to free himself. What he said and did is truly his ; how you reacted to it and still react is yours. You have hurt yourself ; you are suffering through your own responses to his behaviour. Respond as you will, even though you suffer ; it will be precious to you later. But do not desire that he shall be punished for what he has not done—wounded you. You are wounded through his action, only because you took this burning torture to your breast, holding it there while it scorched. A touch of the old appropriation still ! Yet to avoid the pain would hinder your own growth. Let it burn you, but recognise that the hand that holds the torture instrument your friend provided is your own. And let the torment end as soon as it may. Don't go on forever, in memory, reopening your wound.

One day, you will find operating another factor in awakened spiritual consciousness ; intense living in the Present rather than in Past or Future. "The student must avoid pain not yet come", is one of Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms*. "Let the dead bury their dead", comes from another high source. Your wound will heal, if you will allow it ; your love will continue, intensified ; your suffering will be transmuted into *Sattva,* Harmony, Beauty, Bliss. Is not that Reward enough ? Why, when you are so rich, seek barren recompense in the name of what other men call Justice ? Only long that one day your friend may be as rich as you are—ask for him no other retribution from the Law. That is Freedom ; the Breaking of the Chain.

E. V. HAYES

THE QUEST FOR HAPPINESS

[Paul E. Johnson is at present Professor of Philosophy and Dean of Morningside College at Sioux City, U. S. A. Most of his life has been spent in study, in the course of which a knowledge of the Chinese language and of the civilization of China was acquired—in China itself, where he taught for a time at Chengtu, Szechwan. He is a Ph.D. of Boston University.—EDS.]

The passing of time, like sand slipping through the spindle of an hour-glass, is cause for meditation. We cross a threshold from one year to another, an imaginary line marking off segments of history in the onward sweep of the tide of events. In the calm perspective of eternity, a year of time is but a ripple on the boundless ocean of infinity. But to the race of men who rush frantically to and fro in breathless haste, this year takes on the solemn portent of destiny. Anything can happen in a year of human life. Good fortune or ill, sickness or health, success or failure, death or life may overtake us. In the presence of such a mysterious destiny, some stand on tiptoe straining a listening ear to catch the silent music of the spheres, while others flee before the terror of the unknown and desperately refuse to think.

It is customary to greet the unknown future with a chorus of "Happy New Year!" In that chorus is the sad dissonance of woe which the race has suffered in years gone by, the wistful note of plaintive hope and the lusty crescendo of determination that better days must be on the way. Do you also join the chorus, and then pause to ponder over that word "Happy"? Does every one want to be happy? By what right do we expect, even demand, the right to be happy? The quest for happiness is one of the oldest and one of the youngest of human desires. This greeting epitomizes the whole pent-up longing of men, women and little children for life over-brimming with joyous peace.

And everywhere the world around, these frantic longings for happiness are celebrated at the turn of the season with fantastic rites and ceremonies. In China feasting and firecrackers salute the turning of time. In America hilarious devotees dance through the night to the weird wail and tom-tom of primitive melodies. Elsewhere wine flows freely to drown the sorrows of the past and to bring men to the stupor of inebriation. Is this the happiness we seek? Rather is it but the tawdry substitute for that happiness, the empty husk of sensual pleasure. Thrills of the riotous night are dull thuds and aching voids the morning after. Time and again men betray themselves into maudlin futilities, denying themselves the abiding satisfactions that might otherwise crown life with beauty and harmony. "As a man soweth, so shall he also reap." Desires sown to corruption are bound to reap the harvests of degradation and despair. The moral law (also known as the law of *karma*) does not force evil and suffering upon us. It is we ourselves who sow false desires and reap the frustrating consequences of our own and of others'

mistakes.

The true happiness so often sought in vain is not pleasure of the senses, but peace of the inner life. "Thou hast touched me", confesses Augustine, "and I am on fire for thy peace." The New Testament speaks little of happiness, but often of blessedness :—

> Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled... Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God... Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

The blessed life of peace is the fruit of harmony within and without. Conflict and discord shatter the peace which makes life supremely worth living. Prayer has often been misunderstood to mean a bowing of the head, a folding of the hands, a bending of the knee, a pouring out of passionate words in fervent petition. Prayer may take these forms, but none of them is the essence of prayer. Prayer is an experience of harmony with God. It is coming into focus with the cosmic perspective, coming into tune with the cosmic purpose, coming into congenial co-operation with the cosmic value-making process. "Not my will, but thine be done", was the greatest prayer of Jesus. "Whatsoever is good for thee, O Universe, is good for me", was the harmonious spirit of Marcus Aurelius. When we attain this sustained poise of harmony with all that is good, true and beautiful in the universe, nothing can disturb the even tenor of our dedicated life.

How may we possess this "peace that passeth all understanding"? At this point in our search for the blessed life we meet the stern counsels of asceticism. To those who have been deceived by the senses, it may seem necessary to cut off all desire in defence against false desire. To them pleasure is a snare and a delusion, for the temptations of the flesh may lure us away from the life of the spirit. The ascetic mood stalks among the pleasure haunts of men, pointing the finger of scorn at all delights of self-indulgence. Pleasure is either beside the point or definitely evil to those who are committed to the more serious business of living heroically. This is not the code of any one religion, but the creed of heroism wherever it is found. Self-sacrifice is the natural outcome of devotion to a cause that is greater than self. It is possible to make a fetish of sacrifice, and to mutilate oneself or to deny oneself merely as an exercise in self-discipline. We do need to practise self-control in little ways to be prepared for the greater demands that crises bring upon us. But one may be just as selfish in self-denial as in self-indulgence. If one is sacrificing for his own glory he is every bit as futile as he is in seeking pleasure for his own enjoyment. There is a mean and foolish denial which is miserly and contemptible, which is selfish and far removed from heroism.

When we come to the heart of the matter we see that the great divide is between seeking to save or seeking to give one's life. In trying to save ourselves we withdraw within ourselves, shrivel up, atrophy and die the slow death of spiritual starvation. But in offering freely to give ourselves we expand the dimensions of life to the outer rim of the lives of others with whom we identify ourselves. "It is

more blessed to give than to receive." The deeper joy of abiding peace wells up from the flowing springs of eager sacrifice for others. The selfish life is miserably absorbed with one's own injuries and disappointments. The unselfish life is glowing with the incandescent flame of devotion to the welfare of others, radiant in the joy of self-forgetful service and love. This contrast is well illustrated in the parable of the prodigal son. The return of the prodigal brought joy to the father, because he loved his son more than his own life, and rejoiced that the son who was lost and dead was now found and alive again, restored to the family circle. But the elder brother was angry that so much attention was showered upon the prodigal brother. He refused to come in to welcome his brother or join in the joy of the household, for it injured his pride. He had stayed at home and worked hard, and no such feast had been prepared for him to make merry. Thinking only of himself, of his own disappointment and of the injustice to himself, he robbed himself of the joy that he might have had in the recovery of his lost brother. So every one who cares more for himself than for others cheats himself of the blessed joy that he might have in the sharing of his life with another's need.

Love goes far beyond justice, in that love freely gives without counting the cost. Love therefore is the healing of our divisions and discords, the creation of triumphant harmonies that merges life with life until all are one in all. It is this truth in action which makes human love divine. H.P. Blavatsky says that higher than justice is " the giving to others *more* than to oneself—*self-sacrifice*. Such was the standard and abounding measure which marked so pre-eminently the greatest Teachers and Masters of Humanity—*e.g.*, Gautama Buddha in History, and Jesus of Nazareth as in the Gospels. This trait alone was enough to secure to them the perpetual reverence and gratitude of the generations of men that come after them." (*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 199) So the Belgian priest, Father Damien, gave his life as an offering of love and sacrifice to alleviate the sufferings of the lepers at Molokai. In so forgetting himself in service to others, he contracted the disease and shared their sufferings, but gloriously shared also in the blessed joys of ministering to their need. How much greater is the happiness of those who give their lives for others than the shallow pleasures of those who seek to save themselves by the ease of indulgence ! A happy year is a year of life offered for the blessing of all.

PAUL E. JOHNSON

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

[K. N. Dutt graduated at Cambridge in Natural Sciences. He is now teaching Physics in a college in the Punjab, and occupies his spare time in writing.—EDS.]

Two methods are recommended, one secular, the other religious, for securing happiness. The former aims at strengthening will-power, work-capacity and system; efficiency brings success, and success happiness. The religions recommend a turning away from the world and secure happiness in a subjective way. Neither has been found satisfactory. Is there another way?

The increasing gloom of the educated unemployed shows a growing part of the population whose ambitions are unfulfilled, and whose outlook does not harmonise with its environment. Many a university man nowadays is forced to work as a ticket-puncher. How is such a man to be happy? His external adjustments are all wrong and he cannot help it.

The sense of humour is a phial on our mental shelf which ought to be taken down for use more often than it is. The capacity of laughing at *yourself* dispels gloom. You must be able to turn upon yourself the eye of an onlooker. Laughing at others is not real humour, but sarcasm. But if you can laugh at yourself, you have acquired a golden talent. If we could plan our steps with the precision of a mathematical equation, then failure might well make us dejected. But in our equation of life and endeavour, there are two variables which can never be eliminated, called chance and luck. Then why can't we logically laugh at frustration?

It is more than likely that cultured minds incline towards the contemplation of some particular thing or type of things. The ocean was a theme of Byron's greatest moments. Wordsworth used to be inspired by small flowers growing in the wilderness. The commonest example of a marked inclination of mind is a hobby, such as philately. Possessing an object of rapture enables us to be alone with something totally unconnected with our maladjusted external contacts.

The object of rapture need not be anything so concrete as philately. It may be an Idea. The works of many great artists in every domain are devoted to the exposition of an Idea. In the works of Thomas Hardy the Idea is a frustration of noble human aims due to an ill fate ever present in men's lives. On gloomy philosophic contemplation, he raised himself above dejections. I have come across some strange examples of objects of rapture. Dame Laura Knight finds hers in the life of a circus. Cecil Aldin, another artist, finds his rapture associated with the life of dogs.

The object of our rapture may be stillness; the swoop of birds or the sound of wind or of water; it may be the smell of hay, or the twitter of small birds in fields. As a method of escape from dejection, we must examine the inclination of our mind and discover an object of rapture.

The ordinary mode of dispelling de-

jection has two disadvantages : For example, our companions may not always be available ; we are dependent on others. Its second disadvantage is that it does not go deep enough for the man who is suffering from a depression. Depression is something more fundamental and profound than a child's tears, and must be combated with some fundamental process of the mind. Another factor of personal happiness is " Confirmations ". Do you find your notions and your various beliefs being confirmed by the things you see happening around you, or do you find yourself being contradicted ? A man's happiness is affected by the confirmations and contradictions which he encounters in his day-to-day life. The man who has a wrong notion of his dignity, for instance, is hurled into gloom if he discovers that people do not pay him the attention he expects. But the man who has gauged his social standing correctly, is free from such unpleasant revelations. Social attention when bestowed on him, will cause him pleasure, but social neglect will fail to cause him much unhappiness. All things turning out contrary to our expectations do *not* contribute to our mental satisfaction. We must guard against such contradictions by developing a balanced judgment, freedom from prejudice and preconceived notions ; sympathy and a realization of the irregularity of human behaviour.

In my experience the two most powerful acquisitions against dejection are Mental Detachment and the capacity for Self-Expression. Mental Detachment means a state of being alone. We all like to have our own room, our particular nook where our things remain undisturbed and people cannot see us. This is a human characteristic. Even in a room crowded with noisy people, if we could have our own table in a corner where we can turn our back on the company, and read our letters, and keep our confidential things in a drawer, then we could have a secure, cosy feeling. The man is to be pitied who cannot have his own nook.

There is a nook of the mind also, an inner chamber, where we may retire and be alone. There are two parts to a man, independent of each other : one is in association with others. The second is independent and alone. We usually neglect the second part of ourselves. We may not even discover it, if we never get away from others before whom we are constantly posing. Sometimes we try to be witty, sometimes we pretend to be sympathetic ; almost always we conceal our real feelings. We are never at peace with ourselves.

But being alone brings a deep relief. Then we are natural. If you are dejected, try the effect of being alone. You will say that loneliness will only make you brood more. You will suggest the company of friends when you are depressed, or any other thing to keep the mind occupied and prevent it dwelling on sadness. It is like trying to forget a colic in sight of a favourite dish, while what you need is an internal remedy.

But the profound satisfactions of a state of loneliness are worth seeking. Being alone is not a simple matter. There is, in the first place, a complete absence of pose. Such a

state acts like a balm. In constant association with others, pose becomes a habit. We tend to become less frank, even with ourselves; we hide from ourselves the true aspect of things, and at the back of our mind we are semiconscious that we are being counterfeit, yet we never move away from our surroundings. The result is tension in the mind, a direct cause of depression. We can be natural much more easily alone. When you are depressed, walk into some lonely green field, preferably at sunset. Here is something in your own mind and also in your surroundings, which cannot be affected by the outer world: the "still waters" are here.

There is another effect which loneliness produces—Repose with a capital R, the repose of which Henry James spoke, and of which Charles Morgan wrote in *The Fountain*. Restlessness is the disease of people in these days. Our literature reflects it. Hardly one book in twenty has repose—that quality which makes us turn back to it as "a corner of refuge"; and there is "that unrest which men miscall delight".

Repose comes of profound philosophy, but let the plain working man, who has little time for philosophy, try the method of loneliness. For the more advanced mind it is not necessary to go away into a lonely place. You can retire into that secret inner chamber even in the midst of company. But this requires development. The mystics seem to have so developed the secluded, unapproachable part of their mind that commotion in their surroundings almost always left them calm. We may not be ready to renounce the world entirely, but let us strengthen the power of Mental Detachment.

The last and perhaps the greatest antidote against dejection is self-expression. Self-expression needs two things—the idea and the medium. The painter and the sculptor are essentially similar persons, but their mediums of expression are different, colour and stone. Music, body-rhythm, as in dancing, clay, wood, are all mediums through which ideas can be expressed. We cannot properly say that the plain carpenter who joins a simple chair is expressing an idea, as we cannot say that the garrulous fool who rhymes a ditty has expressed an idea in the way that Byron expressed one in his "Isles of Greece", or the fourteenth century woodworkers have in the Venetian Cathedrals. No work almost wholly mechanical can be called self-expression. Yet it would be foolish to condemn all work which falls short of the standard of Byron and Venice, as non-expression. There are degrees descending into non-expressive, mechanical efforts and also ascending beyond measure.

Self-expression is the most active source of mental satisfaction. It not only counteracts dejection, it produces new happiness. By not expressing something of your own (and this is the way most people go through life), you leave unexplored an active source of satisfaction; if you leave unexpressed something really strong and clear in you, something that is urging for an outlet, like lava in the earth's bowels, then you will be miserable. It is usual for persons with such marked tendencies to discover a medium and use it. Nothing can

restrain them. But the plain man must, with conscious effort, try to increase self-expression as he would increase his physical fitness with exercise.

We then arrive at this very straightforward and concrete conclusion for the self-expression of the normal, ordinary man, so that he may lead a happier life : he must express his feelings and ideas through a medium, which in most cases would be writing or speaking. The audience is essential to self-expression, but we must be immune to adverse criticism. We must not allow our expression to be affected by public opinion.

For most people I suggest they should commit their ideas to writing. You will find that the originality of your mind and the power of your expression will increase astonishingly. Sustain the hope of being able to publish a small article, a pamphlet or a book. Seize upon an opportunity of speaking in public. Perhaps the plain man is thinking that the impossible roles of philosopher and orator and author are being suggested. But let the "plain man" try and he will be astonished to discover what he is capable of. He may not be a Tagore, but he is more than he thinks. Of course we hear of people who overrate themselves coming to grief. Self-conceit is different from what I am pointing out. Self-expression is something higher and deeper than the human desire for the limelight.

There is no branch of knowledge which cannot be a medium for your ideas on life in general. The chemist, when he sees tiny bubbles rising in a test-tube, and then losing themselves in the atmosphere, will not have to project his mind far to connect this phenomenon with the myriad human lives he sees in the world around him. Bubbles trying to rise and then losing themselves in a vast environment, is no mean theme for poet or philosopher.

Self-expression is easier if you try to interpret life in terms of some universal principle. The economist sees life in terms of supply and demand ; the biologist in terms of struggle for existence or of evolution ; these are examples of a universal principle by which you can interpret most if not all things which you meet. Self-expression will be facilitated if you fix your mind on one such principle. Life can be interpreted according to many principles, but for individuals these would lead to utter confusion and non-expression. (*Cf.* the fox who knew a hundred tricks, but got confused when in mortal need of one.)

There is loss of sentiment in the post-war generation, which is nothing but annihilation of uplifting, elevating, ennobling feeling. There is less happiness and satisfaction in life. Hurry and mechanics have taken the place of Self-Expression which produced the Arts.

K. N. DUTT

A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

V.—THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES

[Mr. Alban G. Widgery, at present Professor of Philosophy at the Duke University (U.S.A.), delivered the Upton Lectures in Oxford last November. Special arrangements made with him have made possible the publication of the six lectures in condensed form as six articles, the fifth of which we give this month.—EDS.]

A philosophy of religion must include an investigation into the significance of religious practices. It may find that the implications of these may represent the nature of religion better than the allied doctrines which always carry on forms of expression of earlier types of philosophy that may not be suitable for present thought. Religions can and do continue even though traditional doctrines are modified or abandoned. Religious practices also change in the course of history, but through all their changes there are continuities in their fundamental implications. It is with these implications that a philosophy of religion is concerned, not, except incidentally, with their detailed characteristics which have always been relative to time and place as well as to that which they have endeavoured to express. For religious practices are not merely relative : they have some ultimate significance.

The practices of religion have all too often been intertwined with those of magic. Religion and magic must be distinguished. In magic the result is supposed to follow inevitably as a consequence of the performance of specific acts or the utterance of particular words, and frequently it has been supposed that these acts or words must be those of a magician. In religion the result is supposed to follow the practices or words used, not inevitably, but only according to the attitude of some reality other than man as finite, to whom the words are addressed and before whom the practices are performed.

Though in the earlier stages of religion the practices were performed mainly because of a supposed relation with physical welfare, such as the obtaining of food, in the higher developments many of the practices have little or nothing to do with physical welfare. They manifest the existence of spiritual needs in the subject, and they implicate something other than the finite spirit that provides scope for some, if not at any stage as yet complete, satisfaction. Even the practices having reference to physical welfare have an implication of importance for a philosophy of religion. This is the implicit acknowledgement that even physical well-being is not dependent solely on the work of man together with the processes of a self-subsistent physical world, but that some power or being other than these is an important factor upon the attitude of which the success of work may rest.

In the higher religions, then, practices are not concerned primarily with the satisfaction of bodily needs. Neither are they, as some modern

writers would have us believe, merely forms for the preservation of the social group. There are communal practices, but even these are in general directed to somewhat beyond the community. Whole communities have given themselves up to vast and continuous painful efforts for the building of temples, the object of which has not been that therein the communities could assemble to cultivate a communal solidarity, but in order that something beyond the community could be worthily worshipped. There have been religions in which communal expression has been little emphasised. In all religions that form of expression has been chiefly for special occasions : the religious practices day by day have been those of the individual alone or of only small groups. That the practices of religion have often expressed and promoted social solidarity is only a secondary result, not their main motive.

The individual comes to a practice of religion when he has come to a certain stage in which he is painfully aware that he is not satisfied with himself or his fellow-men ; or, on the other hand, when he becomes cognisant of something that arouses in him a feeling of awe or reverence. In his acts of worship his sense of his own inadequacy often becomes intensified, and yet to some degree he seems at the same time to be raised above it, to be saved from it. Religious practices are of significance on both these sides. In some of them the individual gives expression more especially to the feeling of his own insufficiency, his insignificance as over against—not nature or his fellow-men—but something other than these that vastly transcends them. Some of the postures of prostration and the low bowing of the head, for example in Muslim prayer, are of this type. Other practices give expression to a feeling of joyful triumph, to singing and shouts of praise, aroused by the awareness of the capacity of the deity to overcome the evil, and by the impression of such divine qualities as majesty and glory.

Some religious practices are related with particular aspects and events of the individual's life, such as birth, marriage and death. These are often combined with acts, not specifically religious, of a sanitary or social character. Attention to these latter has led some to ignore and even to deny the distinctively religious aspects of practices in these connections. The origin of a new human being, the experiences of sex, and the event of death, have not become less mysterious, less awe-inspiring the higher man has arisen spiritually. In the religions these have never been regarded as implicating nothing more than the physical and the social. It is not possible for modern thought in terms of the physical and the social to satisfy entirely the attitudes mankind adopts to these events. A philosophy of religion therefore must acknowledge here the recognition in religion of a relation of man to something other than the physical and the social, something that arouses specific forms of response which call for rites and ceremonies to express them.

Among the most general of religious practices is that of prayer, considered not as contemplation but as

supplication. The first significant thing here is that mankind from early times should have adopted such a practice and have continued it into the highest stages of religion. Prayer implicates not merely needs on the side of the subject, but also the apprehension of a being upon whom the response is dependent. It is an attitude towards a spirit able to understand what is asked. The problem that has been raised with regard to prayer is whether it is, or indeed, can be answered. If it is answered, of course it necessarily follows that it can be. But whether prayer is answered cannot be definitely established so that a philosophy of religion could definitely affirm that as a truth. For it cannot be shown in any case that what happens would not have happened without the prayer. Further, it may also be urged that if the prayer is for something which God intends it will happen without the human prayer ; while if it is for something in opposition to what He intends He cannot be expected to grant what is asked. There is much in that contention, especially when the prayer is concerned with what involves the physical world. Nevertheless, where spiritual ends are sought, it may be replied that what God intends involves the attitude of prayer on the part of His creatures, and that without it achievement is not possible. For if the degree of freedom of human minds is to be preserved, and if the subjective attitude is an important essential in religion, prayer may be necessarily implicated in attaining some spiritual results. But may not prayer be of effect even with regard to the physical ? That cannot be ruled out as a possibility. Prayer has been associated with what has been called the " spiritual healing " of the body ; and the power of the mind over the body has frequently been insisted on in the religions. Nevertheless, it cannot be shown that prayer is answered.

It has sometimes been asserted that prayer cannot be answered in the physical realm because its processes are uniform and unvarying, prayer or no prayer. That contention is not so frequently made as it used to be, because now it is more clearly recognised that events occur through conjunctions of different uniform processes, and the conjunctions are not themselves capable of being described as mechanically repetitive. In short, the fact of contingency is acknowledged. Without that, human history would be no different from the repetitive processes of a machine. In history diverse physical processes are brought into varying conjunctions to some extent through the play of human purposes and the exercise of human mental power. Thus it is not metaphysically impossible to maintain that God, though making no change in the character of the uniform processes that science describes, may nevertheless exert influence with regard to their conjunction. Though it may not be possible to establish that prayer is answered ; it is not in opposition to science to maintain that it can be answered.

But the higher the stage in religious development the less the emphasis on prayer as the way of obtaining results in the physical world, the more the insistence on the use of one's own intelligence and strength. That has

not ruled out prayer for physical results, but has turned attention to the character of such prayer as a reverent acknowledgement that even physical welfare is ultimately dependent on God, that the range of human intelligence and power would be insignificant if it were not in relation with a physical world that is dependent on God. The higher the stage in religious development the greater the emphasis on prayer as an aid to spiritual growth. For in prayer the devotee, as it were, "holds converse" with the deity and must inevitably endeavour to adopt an attitude of mind in accord with the sentiments of awe, reverence, and praise that arise in his apprehension of God. His spiritual progress in no small measure goes along with his experience and cultivation of such sentiments.

Prayer, even when a number of persons join in it, is unequivocally an individual act, calling for a definite attitude of mind by each individual. That persons may feel a greater confidence or some increase of intensity of emotion when they pray together does not alter this fact. So also, notwithstanding what may be said of a "fellowship of silence", contemplation, meditation, yoga, is essentially an individual affair. In this—taking these terms to apply ultimately to the same thing—there is in religion an effort for and the cultivation of an awareness of and a harmony with a reality wider than the self apprehended as finite, and other than physical nature or human society. This reality may be described as the eternal Brahman, or as personal deity, and the aim as unity in the One or as communion with the Supreme. In this connection Orientals have talked of "God-realisation", and Occidentals of the "beatific vision".

Great emphasis has been given to yoga in India. The term has come to be used with reference not only to the aim but also to the means to its attainment. It has been associated with diverse forms of theoretical expressions of religion, and it has become associated with much that is extraneous and of doubtful value. Nevertheless it implicates on the one hand the subordination of the physical and the social, and on the other the central character of religion as a relation of the individual with a reality that transcends these and himself as a finite spirit, however the relation and the transcendent may be theoretically expressed. It involves the supremacy of the spiritual over the physical. In the practice of yoga the human spirit centres its attention on spirituality and on the attainment of a sense of freedom from physical and social limitations.

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

MAN AND DEITY IN ORIGINAL BUDDHISM

[The researches of **Mrs. Rhys Davids** into the original texts of the Buddhist scriptures have made her one of the authorities on the subject.—EDS.]

We read always, we hear often, that Buddhism was, from the first, a gospel wherein man has banished God from earth and from heaven. This, it is conceded, is held to be proved by negative rather than by positive evidence. Thus Buddhism is said to have brought no new aspect of the Divine to the Many, such as Zarathustra's Good Mind, Good Word, Good Deed, or Jesus's pitiful Father of the humble and the contrite, or Muhammad's loving Accepter of devotion. It taught no prayers, it devised no sacraments, it sang no praises. Was it not rightly to be called antitheistic? At least until, in its far Eastern development, its "Awakened" Founder was deified into an Ādi-Buddha, a primæval Spirit, sending emanations, as Gotama and the rest, to earth to bring help?

But what is it, in general terms, to be antitheistic? Is it just to put aside this or that old God-picture of a day when the New is working in man to seek after a worthier conception? There will then be antagonism to a specific form of theism; there will not be necessarily antitheism in general. Did not Emerson write about: "When half-gods go, the gods arrive?" Disdeification of a sort there will be, when this happens. Take the verse from the venerable *Dhammapada* of the Buddhist canon:—

> Nor even deva, nor the sprite who bringeth luck,
> nor Māra with a Brahmā could unmake the victory by such a person won—

the victory, namely, over the lower self. I have lately heard this cited in public as evidence that early Buddhism was antitheistic, and by an Indologist, his conclusion being that since all great and yet living religions were theistic, Buddhism earned this title only by becoming, in Mahāyāna, theistic, as it were, in spite of its founders.

But when the first Buddhist mission started, there had been perhaps a century-old teaching of a new Immanent religion in the North Indian Brahman schools, with this result, that the Vedic "devas" had become mainly picturesque figures for conveying religious vistas and concepts to the young. Even the sublime impersonal concept of *Brahman*, source of all, end of all, had been made personal by the appearance of a masculine *Brahmā* on the religious horizon: Brahman the unutterable and Brahmā the Perceptible, the enthroned. Further, there had grown up the concept of a world better than that to which man first went at death: the *Brahmā-loka*, where lived his fellow men who, having gone before, had there died and been found worthy to go in survival yet further. And so elastic had become the word "deva", that it was used occasionally to express the five senses.

No one with any knowledge of Buddhist scriptures worth the name would ever see in the Brahmā of the verse cited any but an other-world fellow man of relatively higher worth;

never would he see in it a reference to that supremely Divine, surviving in such compounds as *Brahma-chakka* : God-wheel, *Brahma-carya* : God-living, *Brahma-bhūta* : become God. A deva was no longer exclusively one to be worshipped, to be sacrificed to, to be invoked. The word, I say, had taken on a new elasticity, resembling the range of our term " spirit ".

If early Buddhism seem to have disregarded the sort of theism we of a Semitico-Hellenic tradition look for, it was but carrying on the accepted teaching of the Brahmanic schools of its day, through which most of its first missioners had passed. It is rare in the Upanishad academic lessons, early or late, to find prayer or priesthood or praise.

Into this realm and day of Deity, come to dwell within the man—" Brahman we worship as the self!"—arose the man Gotama with no new mandate as to the Highest—the day was not needing it—but with an urgent mandate for man of the crying need to become, by his daily life, and not only in belief, in knowledge, the divine offshoot which he was told that he was. Here on the one hand, were a day and a realm where teachers of noble and priestly youth were exploiting a new and astonishing uplift in the conception of God and man—the ultimate identity of both—in that the supreme Brahman was worshipped as the manifest worth in " self " of each man. Here, on the other hand, was a certain lack, in this uplifting mandate, of insight into the need of long and most pressing work in transforming potentiality of nature into actuality of nature. " That art *thou* ! " was needing to be rendered as " That canst thou become." Hindus do not like my saying this, but the fact remains, remains as yet without any worthy rejoinder, that the early Upanishads lack earnest emphasis on the need, especially in such a mandate, of the whole earth-life being quickened and sublimated into a training in thought, word and deed, of what man had it in him, not so much to be, as to come to be. Yet an acorn, he was told he was the oak tree. To become that, what years upon years of growth were necessary !

To realize that we have here the real mandate of Gotama, and no anti-theistic implications about it, we need first to compare Piṭakan with Upanishadic emphases. In the former the immensely preponderant emphases are on man's need to train himself in good ways of life. The frequent exhortation : " Tell yourselves : thus and thus must there be training ; we will become—this or that ", is sadly overlooked by critics, let alone Buddhists. We need secondly to ponder critically the apparent slighting of the external " theistic " observance here and there in the Pali records. Scathingly Gotama is shown referring to those who believed that by merely and repeatedly invoking this and that manifestation of Deity—Indra, Varuṇa, Prajāpati—a happy rebirth could be insured at death. There is here no denial of the reality of either Deity, or devas, or worlds, or rebirth. The emphasis lies in the need to set afoot the right will-in-becoming, and so to live here as to be fit for the worthier fellowship hereafter. Not for the fellowship of the supremely Highest ; the wise reticence of the early

Buddhists as to That is a most worthy pendant to their earnestness in stirring up men to wayfare persistently in the long Between separating the ideal from the actual.

When, then, we read in manuals or hear from speakers, that Buddhism has nothing clear to say about God or soul, or the nature of the bond between them, let us more *justly consider the setting of early Buddhism in its frame of current Immanence, and its true mission within that frame.* Let us also consider more historically the specific objective of the founders. Their mission was, not to the few in the Academy, but to the Many without ; not to the learned—albeit to these too its mandate was applicable —but to man in the home, the field, the market place. The majority were not devotees of the inner teaching of the Brahmans, but were worshipping God in many worthless ways. None the less the impact of the Immanence upon the younger generation of Brahmans was bound to be immense ; the Many for whom these would be " celebrating " were bound to be more or less affected by it. And the Many are always rather more than less practical. They would apply the " New " to their life, not merely holding it at arm's length in thought. The new aspect of man's nature would arouse in them a sense of the importance of man's life. They would begin to see this as they never before had seen it. And they needed teaching about life as being a trust, an opportunity in man's long way through the worlds. That was the God-word the Many were needing. They were coming to feel after religion (which they vaguely called " *dharma* ") as something bound up with man's relation to man, as something with which their happiness was bound up. This was not clearly known or worded. It was Gotama's work to word it for them :—the worthier life and its consequences :—this was his God-word ; this was his God-spell ; this was his " dharma."

And it is just in this hitherto vague word " *dharma* ", Pali : " *dhamma* ", that, so far from teaching antitheism, he *taught a new theism.* To judge by the *Piṭakas,* the promise for him of a worthier conception of the Highest, then conceived as Self, lay in the word " *dharma* ". I have seen this taken to mean ultimately " the stable ", because of its stem *dhṛ,* " to bear " (usually qualified as " to bear in mind "). But this is due to our present unfortunate omission of the *man* from the idea. The bearing in mind is only true and important when we keep in view the bearer-in-mind, and the Man as borne in mind. And This is primarily a thing not stable, but dynamic, a Live One, a Quickener of mind. In the solitary moral lesson we find in the *Upanishads,* teaching the student what should be *done,* he is told to " walk according to dharma ". He is not merely to think, or remember or be steadfast ; he is to walk, to act, to behave. That is, according to the prompting of a something within that was More than he : a standard, a norm, as I used to say, taking the word to mean, as it scarcely does, not an average but an ideal. The powerful figure used for the Self conceived in this way as the Man in the mind, the Watcher, the Witness, the Monitor, the Ought to-be, the Divine Urge whom we with our term conscience

should more justly call the "conscience", was *Antaryāmin*, the Inner Controller. And it is a thousand pities that the term, if ever used by the first Buddhist missioners (who were mainly Brahmans) was not taken over by the Pali Sayings. It is only too likely that, as the real man of the self became progressively deprived of deity and then dropped entirely, this term was let die. That the higher self is called lord (*nātha*), witness (*sakkhi*), goal (*gati*) : these have fortunately been let in, and betray the possibility of earlier companion-terms.

The plural *dhammā*, in the Sayings, meant just "things". (The notion that it meant metaphysical entity or monad is quite impossible in any but the scholastic Buddhism of centuries later.) But in the singular it meant, not "thing", but "more-thing" ; less "what is" than "what ought to be". And in a gospel of a more-will to the Better, *dhamma* came nearer to expressing this than any other available word. It points to man's nature as essentially a coming-to-be, a becoming, and to the Highest conceived as the tendency and will to become, working in man. It is a noble crown in the Buddhist mission, most lamentably lost to sight by Buddhists in their identifying it with a mere code or canon of teaching, with the "institutes" of an orthodox scripture.

It is twice recorded, that the founder decided, before he began his teaching, that aspiration for the "Great Self" involved revering *dhamma*, or the inner monitor.

None the less, let it not be forgotten that it was with the term "self" (*ātmā* ; Pali : *attā*) considered as something supremely worth seeking, that Gotama began his mission. Herein he echoed the words of an Upanishadic refrain : "Were it not better that you thoroughly sought for the self ?" But, as I have said elsewhere, because the first translator of this, Oldenberg, in the *Vinaya*, put aside his Sanskrit learning and judged Buddhism as a world apart, we have the misfortune to have learnt the injunction as "seek after yourselves" —a European turn to the text, which no scholar, translating the same words where they occur in the *Upanishads*, ever uses.

And it was with the combined self and "*dharma*" that Gotama ended his long career of service :—

> Live as they who have self as lamp, as refuge, who have "dharma" as lamp, as refuge, and none other.

This too, alas ! has suffered mistranslation at the hands of Rhys Davids and others, being rendered "Be ye lamps unto yourselves", etc., —again the European way of rendering the pronoun from a text where the possessive form ("your" self) is non-existent. Here, too, where in the Upanishads *ātmā-* is prefix in a compound, as it is in the Pali, translators of the former do not hesitate to detach the prefix, where the context demands it, and give it the higher meaning : thus for instance, in *ātma-vidyā* : "knowledge of ourselves and of the Self" ; in *ātma-vid* : "knowing sacred things, not knowing the Self" ; and in the well-known compounds : *ātma-mithuna, ātma-nanda, ātma-rati, ātma-krīḍa* : "intercourse with, delight in, love for, sporting with, the Self." Whether from superficial attention or from a mistaken perspective,

there has been taken the course of severing early Buddhism from its parent and presenting it as a species of Indian agnosticism and rationalism, in short, of antitheism.

But could a message, when and wherever first uttered to man, which eventually grew into a world-religion, have begun as antitheistic? Or begun and later turned theistic, as it were, in spite of its original aim and bent? I think not. I have been accused of using "intuition" in historical treatment, an ambiguous word which I never use or countenance, and which is, I presume, a refined way of saying "guessing". But no, I am holding my opinion on documentary evidence. And I would contend, so far as I yet know, that no religion, starting in the long past and surviving till to-day with a body of scripture, can be truthfully, critically shown to have begun with a disregard of what man has, at the time, looked upon as higher than himself, as the Highest he can conceive, and of his relation to That. Forms of theistic presentation that were getting worn thin:—these may have been either tacitly disregarded, or explicitly put aside. Jainism, never really antitheistic, can be said to be shown doing the latter, if one can read into its late scriptures what was really taught by it just before Buddhism was born. But Buddhism at its birth —so far again as its scriptures can rightly testify—Buddhism with its search for the self as the God-in-man, its holding up of that self and *dharma*, the inner working divine will, as sole light and refuge, its reverence for God-compounded terms, its saying that amity to all men was "what men were calling 'God'", its quest here and everywhere for Deity, reverently expressed in such universally valid terms as Highest, Best, Supreme, Peak (terms far more fit and world-credal in time and space than such locally and temporally used terms as Brahman, deva, or God), with its first and last aspiration towards That whom man needs and seeks, namely "Artha", the term it used before ever Nirvana emerged as a Goal—Buddhism at its birth was in a finer, truer way theistic than other world-creeds. It laid hold, to express man's quest and end, of terms which cannot fade or die save with the ending of man himself.

C. A. F. Rhys Davids

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

NON-ATTACHED MAN AND FREE SOCIETY[1]

[Sri Krishna Prem, well known to our readers by his series of articles on the *Bhagavad-Gita,* as was promised in our March editorial reviews Mr. Aldous Huxley's epoch-making book from the Eastern standpoint.—EDS.]

Once more the rising sun of Indian ideals is gilding one of the high peaks on the Western horizon. All whose eyes are open to the Eternal truths proclaimed by the great seers of the East, all who adhere to what Mr. Huxley calls "the great tradition of civilised Asiatic and European philosophy", must be grateful for this book. Not only that. We must offer our salutations to Mr. Huxley for the courage which has led him to disregard the disapproval of, doubtless, a large section of his former admirers; for the sincerity which is stamped on every line of the book; for the beauty of the words in which he has expressed the ancient truths and, above all, for the clear insight with which he has penetrated to the heart of the jungle of contemporary problems.

There are those (as Mr. Huxley well knows for he was formerly one of them) who proclaim that the world is meaningless and that all ideals are purely temporary phenomena arising out of social and economic causes. In this book he definitely rejects this gloomy philosophy and shows that in general people who consider the world empty of meaning do so because they wish to throw over the restraints that fetter their freedom to do as they please, particularly in sexual and political matters. Moreover it is found that few, if any, can consistently remain for long in such a philosophy but hasten to re-introduce meaning (and usually an evil meaning) into some particular part of the whole, a deified nation (fascism) or an idolised class (communism).

In opposition to all such he shows that, though ideals have varied in time and place, yet the ideals formulated by the few who have been most successful in rising above the limitations of their environments and personal circumstances show a remarkable resemblance. Just as true literature is a quite different thing from the wish-fulfilment stuff that fills the magazines and bookstalls, so true ideals are something quite different from the wish fantasies which commonly pass as such. The latter are a species of day-dreaming while the former are the very norm and pattern of the Universe itself. Both come forth from our minds but the pseudo-ideal has its root in the sub-mental desire nature while the ideal proper descends from the regions above the mind, the regions in which, as every mystic knows, the Divine Reality itself has to be sought and found. Unlike the wish fantasy

[1] *Ends and Means.* An Enquiry into the Nature of Ideals and into the Methods employed for their Realisation. By ALDOUS HUXLEY. (Chatto and Windus, London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

which seeks escape from the facts of the contemporary world, the true ideal, when it can find a heart fit for its growth, gives battle with the world and remoulds it nearer to the Divine norm.

Taking his stand upon the realisation of the mystical teachers of all ages (though, throughout the book, the overtones of at least some degree of personal experience can be heard by an attentive ear) Mr. Huxley shows *that the ideal man is the non-attached man and the ideal society, a free and just society, fit for non-attached men and women to be members of.*

> Non-attached to his bodily sensations and lusts. Non-attached to his craving for power and possessions. Non-attached to the objects of these various desires. Non-attached to his anger and hatred ; non-attached to his exclusive loves. Non-attached to wealth, fame and social position. Non-attached even to science, art, speculation, philanthropy. Yes, non-attached even to these. For, like patriotism, in Nurse Cavell's phrase, " they are not enough."

This non-attachment, which recalls so vividly the teaching of the *Gita*, is by no means a merely negative state. The path to it lies through all the positive virtues and, when attained, it is an intensely positive condition of what he terms charity and awareness, the compassion and wisdom of the Bodhisattva. Some may think the word non-attachment insufficiently expressive. No doubt the word (and also the state) is not too common in the West but, in truth, it is difficult to find a better word (" detachment " has too much suggestion of aloofness) to describe the ideal state of inner poise in which the soul, inactive in the very midst of actions, mingles in all the deeds of men and yet remains untouched by worldly bonds.

All this has been said before, though even for its clear re-statement we are grateful. What has not been done before, or never so adequately in recent times, is the penetrating critique of the means by which these ideals are to be realised. This is the point at which so many have gone astray. Knowing that " hatred ends not by hatred ; hatred ends by love alone ", we have yet given a reluctant assent to policies of " rearmament for the sake of peace " ; knowing that all that leads to separateness is evil, we yet have given some countenance to idolatrous worship of our respective nations ; and knowing that no true Teacher ever trespasses upon the free-will of his pupil, we yet have dallied with the idea that a dictatorship, even if not quite of the Russian or German type, could perhaps provide a remedy for the diseases of society.

But " good ends. . . can be achieved only by the employment of appropriate means. The end cannot justify the means for the simple and obvious reason that the means employed determine the nature of the ends produced." If we seek the end of which all the prophets from Isaiah to Karl Marx have spoken with one voice, the establishment of " liberty, peace, justice and brotherly love " we must be careful to use only appropriate means for its realisation. In all the fields of life, social, economic and political as well as in education and religion we must walk in the direction of that goal and not in the opposite direction. We must shut our ears to the siren voices which assure us that

liberty can be attained by curtailing freedom of thought and expression, that peace can be attained by war (even if called a war-to-end-war), that justice can be achieved by armed force (even if termed the force of collective security) and that brotherly love can come through idolatrous worship of our own nation.

Mr. Huxley enunciates three principles which should guide us in all our efforts for reform. The first is that only strictly necessary changes shall be carried out ; the second is that no reform, however intrinsically desirable, should be undertaken if it is likely to result in violent opposition ; and the third is that desirable changes should be made wherever possible by the application of methods which are already familiar and approved in other fields.

Thus in education we should extend the principle, already applied with excellent results in kindergarten schools, of educating for freedom, intelligence, responsibility and co-operation. At present all that is accomplished in the kindergarten schools is undone in the secondary schools where we inculcate the military " virtues " of slavish submission to superiors and brutal domination over inferiors. In this connection Mr. Huxley has very pertinent things to say about the sinister reversal of Lenin's enlightened educational policy that has been brought about by Stalin in the interests, doubtless, of military efficiency.

In society, the same methods that are at present reducing inequalities should be gradually extended, and in industry we must encourage co-operation and decentralisation, if humanity is not to be crushed in the wheels of its own machines. Evidence is brought to show that industries can be run by small, self-governing groups without any loss of industrial as opposed to military efficiency and in this way, in all fields of life, men will be trained to live in freedom, in co-operation and in brotherhood.

But there is one thing that prevents all these desirable reforms and that is the threat of war which hangs like a great thunder-cloud over the world. While war is imminent the need to be able to wield the whole nation as one man prevents all consideration of higher values.

Long ago Lowes Dickinson wrote that "either we must end war or war will end us". It is quite useless to dream of a final war that will end all war. Hatred and violence breed answering violence and hatred and those of us who entered the last war with ideals (or rather illusions) in our hearts know well the fate that befell them in the brutal and cynical " peace " treaty of Versailles. It was then that the seeds of the coming war were sown and the ancestry of those seeds can be traced through the Franco-Prussian and Napoleonic wars, and the violence with which predatory robber barons established their dominance over an enslaved peasantry. Thus violence goes streaming on through time, echoing and re-echoing forever until neutralised and brought to nothing by its opposite non-violence.

A modern war on a large scale will destroy all the fruits of culture and civilisation in the countries of the " victors " as in those of the vanquished, not only because of the ghastly power and range of modern arma-

ments but because, *in order to defeat the militarily efficient totalitarian states, the "democratic" countries will have to transform themselves into the likeness of their enemies.* Once that is done what will remain that is worth preserving, worth fighting for? The dictators have told us in no uncertain terms what they think of freedom and toleration, freedom of thought and of the press, freedom of science, art, conscience and religion. What their "values" are we all know only too well, and let none think that they are the purely personal characteristics of the present dictators. They are those of dictators in general.

If we wish to end war before it ends us we must seek out the causes and bend our efforts to bringing about their cessation. Neither violence (even if called the force of the League) which always breeds further violence, nor mere socio-economic reforms—badly needed though they are —will suffice to end war. Mr. Huxley shows what the Buddha showed long before, that the roots of war are in our hearts in the form of greed, hatred and stupidity. It is in our own hearts that peace must be established before it can be reflected in the outer world. We must establish peace within and then meet violence without, not by answering violence, fatuously hoping to crush it once and for all (the 1914 arguments whose bitter fruit now fills our mouths), but by systematic non-violence in the manner shown by Deák in Hungary and by Gandhi in South Africa and India.

But non-violent resistance needs training no less than war, training in the overcoming of fear and in self-control even in the face of the most trying circumstances. This training can best be achieved by small self-governing groups of devoted men and women, holding property in common and prepared to live and die for their ideals.[1] Such groups will call for strenuous effort and sacrifices from their members and they will practise a yogic discipline in order to transcend their individual limitations. The sacrifices required, though great, are not greater than those demanded by nations at war and, like monks in their rejection of "the things of this world", they will form living centres of peace and co-operation showing the way to others in the fields of industry and, when necessary, of non-violent resistance. Theirs will be that triumph of persuasion over force which according to Plato is the truly civilised method.

Some readers may be inclined to feel that such pacifism does not agree with the teachings of the *Gita*. It would indeed be a pity if that were so but it is not. Quite apart from the fact that the Kurukshetra of the *Gita* is really the inner battlefield of the soul, it must always be remember-

[1] Such groups will resemble monastic bodies in their common ownership of property and their responsibility to each other, their self-instituted discipline, their personal efforts towards realisation of supra-individual values and in their withdrawal from the sordid life of competitive striving for selfish ends. But they will not be monks in the ordinary sense and it is incorrect to say, as one reviewer did, that Mr. Huxley wished the whole world to become a monastery. Charity, care of the sick and education are not now run by monks though monks were the pioneers in those fields. It is also quite incorrect to say that he holds up the Zuñi Indians as a pattern. He expressly states that they have avoided the evil of aggressiveness only to fall into the other one of sloth. What he does urge is that they afford a proof that human nature is not inevitably and "naturally" aggressive.

ed that even outer war as conceived by the author of the *Gita* was an affair for a professional order of knights who met in equal battle and who lived for fighting. It has nothing whatever to do with the hideous attacks upon defenceless women and children that are the essence of modern war. For the question " Is war right ? " we must substitute the question, " Is it right to blind, poison, mutilate and disembowel innocent women and children ? "—for that is what modern war means when stripped of archaic rhetoric.

To those who urge the forlorn nature of such a hope I would only say that all life seems a forlorn hope. The method of life is not the mechanical one of first laying down a solid ferro-concrete base and then building our tower on it in perfect safety. Life grows from tiny seeds which send out their delicate shoots and rootlets which, though so soft, have yet the power to crack and overturn the hardest masonry. As Lao Tsu puts it : " Nothing under heaven is softer or more yielding than water, but when it attacks things hard and resistant there is not one of them that can prevail."

The problem is no doubt a thorny and intricate one. It is hard to be sure of the consequences of disarmament but, after all, the *Gita* warns us that the true path consists in doing what is right without fear of the results to ourselves. It would seem, therefore, that, whatever may be right for others who do not see it, those of us who see the truth that violence can never end by violence must turn our faces fearlessly towards the Light we perceive and give our hearts as soil in which the seeds of Peace and Life may grow. Our own bodies and those for whom we care may perish in the process but we can be sure of one thing, namely, that every bit of hatred that is overcome by love vanishes forever from the world ; and some day, sooner or later, from those seeds will grow a great tree capable of giving shade to all the peoples of the earth. In the end triumph is certain for the Divine Unity of all life is behind our efforts and, as Huxley quotes from Whitehead, " The fact of the instability of evil is the moral order of the world ", adding, " Evil is that which makes for separateness ; and that which makes for separateness is self-destructive."

However, it should not be thought that pacifism is the main subject of the book. The subject is an enquiry into ideals and the means for their realisation and the book does not stand or fall with the acceptance or rejection of any of the concrete proposals. All the author is concerned to do is to try to find concrete means for the realisation of spiritual ideals, means which will not involve the self-stultifying use of violence. There are valuable hints for the practice of that self-discipline, physical, emotional, intellectual and spiritual which must be followed if we are to tread what the Upanishads term " the ancient narrow path that stretches far away ", the path that leads through consciousness of self to self-transcendence in the Self that is in all. There are important chapters on religious practices, on beliefs and their effect upon conduct and upon ethics, in all of which one can but admire the cer-

tainty of Mr. Huxley's touch, his unwavering fidelity to the spiritual ideals of ancient India (and of mystics all over the world) and the fearless manner in which he tackles the problems of putting those ideals into practice. He does not shirk the difficulties and, if some of his suggestions should prove impracticable after all, he would be the last person to object for they are all conceived in the clear light of reason and are free alike from the ridiculous fanaticisms of the crank and from the lazy opportunism (often miscalled common sense) which betrays the ideals to which it pays lip-service. Behind and above all the special proposals lies the deep spiritual appeal to ultimate values, and even if all the former should have to be rejected, the central message of the book would be unaffected.

Many books have been written on mysticism and the spiritual life but most of them steer clear of the urgent practical problems of society or else take refuge in anachronistic simplifications which can do no good. Much has no doubt been written to help the aspirant with his personal problems but we are all parts of one whole and the spiritual life is not one which should be lived for oneself alone. *Moreover, in an increasing number of countries it is becoming next to impossible even to lead an individual spiritual life.*

Even more books have been written on social reform but not one that I have seen has Huxley's fine sense of the spiritual ideals that must underlie all real progress, nor his unerring discrimination between means that will help to bring about the realisation of those ideals and means that, though plausible, will not.

Those who are afraid of the very word pacifism should not allow themselves to be prejudiced by my inadequate summary of a clearly reasoned and soundly based case but should read the book for themselves. Those who are trying to believe in spiritual ideals should read it to have their faith strengthened by its practical wisdom and those who know for themselves something of their truth and are trying to tread the Path should read it if only to feel shame at the thought of how little they are doing to bring about their realisation in practice. Moreover there are very few, even among real aspirants, who will not be helped and stimulated by the firm grip of, and clear insight into, spiritual values.

There is something in it for every one and all should buy, borrow or steal a copy. It will be very surprising if those who only borrow do not end by buying or stealing.

SRI KRISHNA PREM

THE FREE MAN IN THE WORLD OF NECESSITY[1]

"What I have attempted here", writes Mr. Cranmer-Byng in a Foreword, "is not a guide-book to Utopia, divided into chapters that indicate various stages towards the goal, but the story of myself." And that story, as he adds a few lines later, is "the record of my struggle for emancipation from myself", which ends in "the quest for personality". For how, he asks, shall we raise the community of men unless we first establish the community of man the individual? And of the man in whom that community has been achieved he writes :—

> To be aloof from nothing that is or happens, to let all things penetrate and find their level in the sub-conscious, to hold no opinion rigidly, to wait in patience for the right occasion and act on the inevitable hour, to keep one's sense of perspective unclouded and keen, to discriminate between reality and sham, to adapt oneself to the four seasons without grieving over those that have gone—are not these the secrets of a balanced life and the symbols of a youth renewed with the Spirit of the Corn?

This is the quality of the personality which informs the whole book. For its author is one who, in his own words, has tried the impossible task of living in two cities simultaneously (the cities of eternal being and of temporal existence) only to find in the end that they are one and indivisible; who has bridged, too, the world of the artist and sage and the practical world of local government, and who in struggling to reconcile the two has sweated the slave out of him, to borrow Tchekhov's phrase, desiring as little to share the pedestal of the superior man as the illusions of the crowd.

Like his *Vision of Asia* this is a book steeped in mellow wisdom and revealing beneath the flux of these critical times the deeper currents which, if we can surrender ourselves to them, will yet bring all into harmony. Characteristically it is not bound together by a tight thread of logical continuity. Rather, its many short chapters are like the leaves of a tree. Often the theme of one chapter leads directly on to that of the next. But essentially they are linked together as diverse crystallisations of a life experience. They are divided into two parts, entitled "The Clash of the Egos" and "The Coming of the Artist". And for Mr. Cranmer-Byng the artist is not only the man who is sensitively at home in the realm of feeling. He is also one who fulfils the law of love by giving himself wholly to the work of creation. For him Christ is the supreme artist and he believes that "if the world is to be saved from the catastrophe which all are prophesying then it will be through the renunciation of the artist acting through the urge of a greater Will than his own." Obviously this is to give to the artist a status which he seldom in fact possesses to-day, unless it be in germ. It is to endow him with the qualities of the mystic who has attained liberation without turning his back upon the world. Mr. Cranmer-Byng would be the first to admit that few contemporary Western artists have achieved anything like this degree of spiritual development, or even begun to penetrate beyond the boundaries of the phenomenal world. Indeed he writes in one place that "the profound difference between the Chinese and Western Artist lies in the fact that the former is called upon to be the medium through which new life is expressed, whereas the latter uses all external objects as means for self-expression".

To be an artist in the sense that he gives to it is not merely to reflect life from an original angle or even in moments of inspiration to create forms that reveal its spiritual significance, but to be creative in every act because the self has become whole. And in one of his most suggestive chapters, entitled "Fate and Destiny", he shows how the true artist "breaks the circle of Fate when he accepts it fully and unflinchingly, and thus emerges into the boundless sphere of Destiny". Fate belongs to the order of

[1] *To-morrow's Star.* An Essay on the Shattering and Remoulding of a World. By L. CRANMER-BYNG. (The Golden Cockerel Press, London, 7*s.* 6*d.*)

nature, destiny to that of Spirit, and he who has passed from the level of the typical man, through individuality to personality, is a free man in the world of necessity. For he has entered into the Unity from which all differentiation proceeds and partakes of its infinite creativeness. To achieve such an art of life must clearly involve not only a profound act of self-surrender but prolonged and devoted self-discipline. Mr. Cranmer-Byng however, is more occupied in showing what the achievement of such personality means in all sorts of ways than in defining particular means by which the self may be transformed. And beneath all his meditation is the conviction of rhythm as the supreme law governing the universe. It is because it breaks the true rhythm that he deplores revolution and it is by their rhythmic potentialities that he measures intellect and feeling, real and false education, the earth-centred wisdom of man and the understanding that transcends it, human relationships as distinct from mechanical adjustments, the union of the male and female principles and the marriage between consciousness and life in the shrine of the spirit, the insufficiency of humanism, the law of Nemesis and of recompense, and the nature of a universal religion as contrasted with such little segments of an infinite faith as the religions of an authoritarian State or Church.

From this it will be seen that the book is not an autobiography in the sense of recording the outer events of a life. Rather it distils the ripe wisdom of a life-time and the many apt quotations it contains from modern writers exemplify Mr. Cranmer-Byng's conviction that to create any true pattern we must co-operate. Occasionally he is not quite fair to those whom he quotes to criticise. He seems to me, for example, to miss the meaning of a passage by Mr. Mumford on the lessons we may learn from the machine. But generally his tendency is all the other way. And here and there he even reads more significance into a quotation than it would seem to possess. His own style is flavoured both with wisdom and humour and is always distinctively phrased, as when he writes of a "camphorated Christianity reserved exclusively for the Sabbath", or of an educational system which abandons children at the age of fourteen that "it is simply a grindstone on which the wits are sharpened to serve the appetites". A critic deaf to what is implied rather than stated by this "seeker of equality through quality" might suggest that he has failed sufficiently to stress the element of suffering and sacrifice involved in overcoming the world by dying to the partial self. But even he could not deny the truth and constancy of the vision of the goal that informs the whole book.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

ON ISLAM [1]

One God, one humanity, brotherhood. This is the principal teaching of the *Qu'ran* which is especially to be judged by its practical effect upon the warring and disunited people to whom its revelation was given by the Prophet. In the course of a few years a transformation unparalleled in the history of the world had been effected; lawless Arab tribes had been welded into a highly progressive civilization.

That this transformation was largely due to the powerful personality of the Prophet himself cannot be doubted. Dr. Maulana Muhammad Ali relates for example, that 'Umar sought out the Proph-

[1] *Introduction to the Study of the Holy Qur'an.* By MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B. (The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore.)
The Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. By MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI, M.A., LL.B. (The Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore.)

et to kill him, but upon hearing him recite the first part of the 20th chapter of the *Qu'ran*, his enmity immediately gave place to admiration. On another occasion when the Prophet read out a chapter containing a command to prostrate oneself, even the idolaters present fell down in worship with the single exception of Umayya ibn Khalf who raised some gravel to his forehead.

The first achievement of the revelation of the *Qu'ran* was that of mentally emancipating the Muslims by driving out superstition through a clear statement of the truth. Its chapters are known as "suras" and bear the same significance of steps to the attainment of unity as do the Sanscrit "sutras". Thus the teaching advances by stages clearing away misconceptions that have arisen concerning religious teachings and hence superstition and religious differences. There is only one God, all peoples are his children. He is known as Allah, an underived word, Dr. Ali states, but it bears a striking resemblance to the Sanscrit Aum or Om, Latin Omnis, All, hence such words as Omniscient, Omnipresent, etc., used in reference to the Supreme Being.

Dr. Ali translates *Rabb* as Lord on page 75, whereas Law seems to be a more appropriate rendering, hence Rabbi, Doctor of the Law.

While the name Islam itself denotes "to surrender and become safe", the teaching of the *Qu'ran* emphasises the dominion of man by his subjugation of the forces of nature. Worldly success is thus encouraged as a path to the achievement of moral greatness, as are also the arts and sciences as productive of spiritual culture and the development of faculties of Self-expression, wherefore the progress and achievement of Islam following upon the revelation of the Prophet.

That at a later date controversies should arise and misconceptions creep in concerning portions of the text of the *Qu'ran* itself was perhaps inevitable. It remained for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to throw new light upon these controversial points by elucidating the meaning of metaphorical passages which had come to be taken too literally.

Born in 1836, Ahmad, at an early age, became a student of comparative religion. Convinced, as a result of his studies, of the superiority of Islam, he planned to prepare a commentary in English on the *Qu'ran* to establish his claims for it in the West.

Personal revelation and religious experiences caused him later to issue a manifesto claiming to be the mujaddid of the century, a claim which was accepted by the Muslims who held his erudition in much respect.

Already in opposition to the newly founded Arya Samaj, by issuing a denial of the divinity of Jesus Christ and of his second coming in the person of Jesus, whom he declared to have died like other prophets, he found not only the forces of Christianity against him, but also orthodox Muslims, who, previously supporting him, now accused him of heresy.

An attempt to explain the prophecy concerning a Madhi coming to wage war with the sword to enforce acceptance of the Islamic faith, in a spiritual sense, brought upon him only further resentment and persecution. A later claim to Messiahship led to vigorous opposition and had a schismatic effect upon Islam. Ahmad, however, seems to have qualified the latter claim in his reply to the many attacks made upon him in connection with it.

Both these short studies are full of interest for English readers who wish to become better acquainted with the teachings of Islam.

L. E. PARKER

Time, Cause and Eternity. By J. L. STOCKS. (Macmillan and Co., London. 6s.)

The Will-to-Know (*Jijnāsā*) is the source of the highest human values, such as science, philosophy and religion. Knowledge aims at explanation. To explain an event is to assign a cause. Whatever is caused is in time ; whatever is not caused is eternal. Thus the problem of cause is linked with the problem of time, and with that of the relation of time to eternity or duration. In this book, which presents the subject-matter of the Forwood Lectures delivered at Liverpool in 1935, Professor Stocks starts with the Aristotelian doctrine of the Four Causes and seeks to construct a world-view which " will provide for the spiritual governance of the world ". Especially interesting and thought-provoking is his discussion of the modern views of time and cause. Modern science has become sceptical about the value of the concept of cause. The regularity and uniformity of Nature are due only to the law of averages, and leave much room for the uncertainties and probabilities in individual occurrences such as quanta jumps of atoms. Stocks calls in question Bury's view that history is science, and contends that history and science are divergent in view-points, aims and methods, though ultimately they are mutually complementary considerations of experience. " History shows *man changing*, science shows *matter moving*." History deals with the irrepeatable, the singular, the uniquely individual, while Science is interested in the general, the universal. History stands for the freedom of the will, while science demands absolute determinism.

The apparent antagonism involved in freedom and determinism, history and science, can be resolved by insisting that the individual is free in his voluntary choice of a course of action but he is determined by inexorable laws to suffer the good or evil consequences of his deeds. And this is precisely what the doctrine of Karma in Indian philosophy emphasises. The doctrine of Karma successfully reconciles freedom and responsibility of the moral agent with the rigorous inevitability of the consequences of actions. As regards the relation of the temporal and the eternal our author concludes that the eternal is the cause of the temporal. It is necessary to note against this conclusion that the term " cause " cannot be taken here in a realistic sense, but should be understood in a " māyavic " or illusory sense. The eternal dwells in the temporal. The temporal is the " moving " manifestation of the eternal. The " movement " represents the illusory aspect of what in reality is pure duration. This book will, doubtless, interest all serious students of philosophy and religion.

D. G. LONDHE

Inquisition and Liberty. By G. C. COULTON. (William Heinemann, Ltd., London. 15s.)

Dr. Coulton's new work is in every sense of the word a timely one. Summing up (and in some part repeating) the results of his previous investigations on the Inquisition, he here presents a picture of it, not so much from the theoretical and institutional as from the social standpoint. He shews it, in fact, as it appeared to, and as it affected, the man in the street : and the work owes no small part of its fascination to the number of illustrations of personal experience by which it is interspersed. It is to be noted that his subject is the Inquisition in its fullest sense, as it existed in the mediæval world and has persisted almost to our own day : the Spanish Inquisition, which most people have in mind when they speak of the Holy Office, is treated of only incidentally.

The author's astonishingly wide knowledge and his combative liberalism are a guarantee to the reader of intellectual enjoyment as well as benefit, even though at times he may be provoked to mild disagreement. But above all this is a tract for the times. For Europe is witnessing to-day a renewal of the mediæval conception of orthodoxy, accompanied by the

erection of state machinery for its propagation and for the suppression of dissent, to which even the Holy Office might look with envy. In the new totalitarian states, men's minds are being regimented no less systematically, and disagreement is being put down yet more barbarously, than was the case even in sixteenth-century Spain. Moreover, the new system which has been set up lacks the assurance of Divine revelation which in some measure palliated its mediæval precursor; and in one country in particular it bases its procedure on qualities of blood which (unlike opinions) cannot be changed even ostensibly by human agency. As one reads Dr. Coulton's learned, absorbing pages, one's mind dwells inevitably on the modern parallels, and one realises yet more vividly that what was originally applied to only a small section of the population may develop into a menace to the whole world.

CECIL ROTH

Self-Expression and the Indian Social Problem. By SATYA DASS. (Sharma Niwas, Lahore. Rs. 2-8.)

The Human Family and India. By GUALTHERUS H. MEES, LL.D. (D. B. Taraporevala Sons and Co., Bombay. Cloth, Re. 1-14; Paper, Re. 1-2.)

The severest indictments of India have been concerned with its *social* life. This is partly because, culturally, we are no longer a progressive nation, and partly because we insist upon thinking in complimentary terms about ourselves. Our disinclination to face facts which are not flattering to our self-esteem, has produced grave disorders. We have not even a *national* consciousness of the deficiencies of our social life, and instead of looking forward towards the fulfilment of a social ideal we seem to revert back in order to justify our ineptitude. The day is approaching when things will have to be otherwise.

Mr. Satya Dass' book, *Self-Expression and the Indian Social Problem,* is worthy of consideration if only for the author's treatment of the communal problem in India. It should be read carefully by all who are smugly confident of the superiority of their own beliefs.

In India the socio-religious force is pre-eminent. It weighs too heavy in the balance. This side of the balance, therefore, calls for lightening. The other calls for reinforcement. This book is an attempt at lightening the extra load in the socio-religious scale.

Dr. Mees's *The Human Family and India,* is a more academic approach. It is, however, not a satisfying book. The general reader—to whom the book is addressed—is liable to feel that the author is too pedantic and has theories which are neither based apparently on common sense nor carried to their logical conclusions. He has attempted to cover too much ground and the result is a confusing juxtaposition of ideas and theories. We cannot talk about a culture in this country or even attempt to solve its social problems until we take into consideration the poverty of the great majority. We can no more force a culture upon hungry people than we can solve their social problems by ignoring their vital needs.

In the brief space of, roughly, a hundred and fifty pages the author has attempted a comparative study of ancient Hindu social theories in relation to modern sociology, a study of the four divisions (from the standpoint of work) into which mankind is supposed to be divided; there are chapters on "Nationalism and Internationalism", "Revolution" (without the economic approach!) and "The Coming Stage in World Politics". The average reader is bound to lay the book aside with the feeling that too much has been attempted and that nothing tangible has emerged.

ENVER KUREISHI

Slavery Through the Ages. By LIEUT.-GENERAL SIR GEORGE MACMUNN, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., D.S.O. (Nicholson and Watson, London. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

No one will suppose that this book makes happy reading; but Thomas Hardy was right when he said that a true understanding of humanity "exacts a good look at the worst": and it is one of the author's merits that, while he certainly affords us "a good look" at the institution of slavery, he leaves us to moralise for ourselves. Moreover, he is at pains to assure us that the subject is by no means academic. Indeed, he states that "there are at least four million people in 1937 who are entirely enslaved", mostly in Arabia and China. We cannot be surprised, after reading his pages, that Sir George should rejoice over the Italian conquest of Abyssinia, for Abyssinia seems, until its collapse, to have been the chief modern example of a slave capturing country.

His book forms a terrible illustration of the slowness with which love and spirituality sweep downward into mundane affairs, and to read it is to marvel that the beauty of Buddhism and Christianity should ever have made any headway at all in a world of greed and heartlessness. After an interesting survey of the slave-system in ancient times, he tells us of the glee with which businessmen in most European countries realised how profitable it might be to seize the natives of West Africa and to ship them away to remote lands and to sell them as though they were cattle. It is startling to hear that even Cavaliers and Jacobites were sold into slavery in Virginia, and no less startling to learn that the notorious Judge Jeffreys fined the Mayor of Bristol a thousand pounds, calling him "a damned kidnapping knave". England seems indisputably to have awakened before any other country to the shame of trading in human lives, and the names of Granville Sharp and the more famous William Wilberforce must be honoured for all time. They had to oppose enormous odds, not only from vested interests, but also from the lethargy of the human mind and, as usual, from plausible arguments for leaving matters as they had always been. England abolished slavery in 1807 and so, in word, did the United States (Denmark had done so five years earlier): but it was left to the British fleet to patrol the coasts of Africa for several decades, often with a discouraging sense that its work was of little or no avail. The Americans, for instance, in order to escape from British cruisers, built fast-running clippers which could easily avoid ships which were built in part for fighting. Perhaps there is nothing more strange in this history than the fact that the land of George Washington should have been the last of the Western Powers to abandon slavery.

Until 1787 nobody seems to have been outraged by the ancient institution. In our time there can be few persons, except in Arabia, who would not recognise at once that it is monstrous: and that, perhaps, is the consolatory thought which will allow a reader to put down this book without a sense of despair about our race.

CLIFFORD BAX

Studies in Chinese Art and Some Indian Influences. By J. HACKIN, OSVALD SIREN, LANGDON WARNER, PAUL PELLIOT. (The India Society, London. 21*s.*)

These four lectures were given at the Royal Academy in connection with the Chinese Exhibition two years ago, and Sir William Llewelyn supplies a foreword. They are chiefly concerned with the influences from outside which have affected Chinese art, by far the greatest influence being, of course, from India. M. Hackin gives an authoritative study of the Buddhist art of Central Asia, where so much has been brought to light during the present century in the vast region including Bamiyan, now in Afghanistan, where M. Hackin himself has conducted expeditions, and the oases along the trade-routes in Kashgaria. The sculpture and paintings discovered betray the

mixed influences at work—Eastern Hellenistic, Iranian, Indian and (as Buddhism advanced eastward) Chinese. It is a subject of great fascination. Prof. Siren's lecture is divided into two parts. Early Chinese sculpture is mainly animal sculpture ; and Professor Siren treats particularly of the lions or winged feline beasts placed as guardians to tomb areas, in whose forms he conjectures an infiltration of stylistic traditions having their ultimate source in the land of the Hittites. He also traces a "southern" current of influence shown in the gryphons and chimæra *motifs* having their roots in Achæmenian art and transmitted to China through Bactria. The second part of this lecture is concerned with Buddhist art, which though of Indian origin, reached China in forms which were often no longer purely Indian. But, as is rightly emphasized by Professor Siren, Chinese Buddhist art is "not dependent on foreign influences—quite the contrary. It is rather a process of gradual detachment from the Central models." There is modification, but always the powerful native tradition persists.

The Chinese seem, on the whole, to have been less interested in the iconographic meaning of Buddhist imagery than in its artistic formulation.

And the Chinese genius for rhythmical line created Buddhist sculpture of great beauty ; which brings us to Mr. Langdon Warner's lecture. This deals with the subject not from the archæological point of view but the æsthetic. He shows how essential it is, for appreciation of Oriental sculpture, to understand that the artist's aim was to communicate the sense of an ideal presence, to create a formal image, and that too close a copy of nature was an obstacle to his aim. And he discusses an interesting point : to what degree can the formed abstract idea be disturbed or obliterated by naturalism? Among the beautiful illustrations are some masterpieces of sculpture made in Japan, but following Chinese models long destroyed. Mr. Warner never lets us forget the part played by the material used, and the tools the sculptors worked with.

Professor Pelliot's contribution is an account of discoveries made by Chinese archæologists in China itself, where digging has till lately been clandestine and unscientific. Who knows what may not be unearthed in the future? It is exciting to hear of Chinese painting dating from 1200 B. C. All these lectures are by masters of their subjects and will be valued by all students of Chinese Art.

LAURENCE BINYON

Art and Archæology Abroad. By KALIDAS NAG, M.A., D.Litt. (University of Calcutta.)

As Visiting Professor to the Institute of International Education, New York, for 1930-31, and as the Ghose Travelling Fellow of Calcutta University for that year, Dr. Kalidas Nag had occasion to visit many universities of the West and to lecture before them on Indian culture and civilisation. This book embodies a report of what he saw and found in Europe and America to be of importance from the point of view of Indian research students desiring to specialise in art and archæology. Of Europe—a survey of France, Italy and Greece only is included in the report. Some of the American institutions have been treated in greater detail. We learn also about the archæological activities in the Near East. Although the book cannot be of general interest, a study of it reveals what an immense amount the West spends and what an intense intellectual activity is going on there, in search of the historic truth. It gives us also an idea of what we can and should do in India for the same purpose.

Twenty beautiful plates, one of which is coloured, drawn from different museums of the West and dealing with different subjects, lend additional value to this useful publication.

R. DAS

Ancient History of the God Jesus. By EDOUARD DUJARDIN. Abridged English version by A. BRODIE SANDERS. (Watts and Co., Ltd., London. 5*s.*)

Like many books on this subject, Dujardin's is stronger on its positive than its negative side. What it adds to our knowledge is welcome but one cannot help thinking it a pity that its author should wish to take so much away. The main thesis is that there was before and after Christ a pre-Christianity composed of elements from the old mystery religions which Judaism suppressed. The decay of Rome and its classical religions, and the nationalism of Judah, was the occasion for the re-emergence of the older faiths into a new historical context. That emergence was marked and consecrated by the creation of the myth of Jesus. Therefore, Christianity is neither a complete break with the religious past, nor a development of Judaism. We think of it in these terms because we regard it as a flowering from the divine personality of the man Jesus. But—and here the negative comes in—Jesus is a myth who as a historical figure never had any existence.

The evidence for such a remote event is necessarily conflicting and M. Dujardin subjects what there is to a fierce critical examination, yet one has to remember that the process by which a myth becomes anchored to, and sometimes fulfilled by, an actual historical personage is a familiar one. Our own day, to keep on steady ground, has seen the appearance of those curious Hymns to Lenin in the East, and the growth of a heroic myth round the figure of Zapata in Mexico. Particularly in the case of Zapata, revolutionary leader of Mexican Indians, you can see how part of the content of the mystery religions of the Maya, so long hidden among obscure tribes, is revivified and brought into light by the career of one striking personality.

In quoting that instance, you will notice that I am bearing out Dujardin's positive affirmation. In fact I think it is true not only in Roman times but in our own, and in all, that there exist old religious traditions in obscurity ; and that one of these, or a blend of several, is capable of suddenly taking on a new relevance because the people who cherish it are faced with the impact of strange historical circumstances, and are forced to make their secret faith vivid in full proclamation. The proclamation may take the form of myth ; it will certainly animate men. It will certainly seem new, but as Dujardin's book shows, there are no new religions, only re-birth and renewed communion.

JACK COMMON

The World's Design. By SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

The purpose of this book is to argue in favour of peace. The author shows that there is a natural tendency to co-operation between men ; that such co-operation has been more inclusive as civilization advances ; and he is of opinion that there is a natural tendency towards co-operation of all the different peoples of the world. As the author has had some experience in diplomacy and in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, he is able to criticise closely some of the attempts that have been made in recent years to bring about the abolition of war. He gives us some criticism of collective security and sanctions, to both of which he is opposed in principle ; and he ends the book with high praise for Great Britain as the chief instrument of reform in international affairs. His summary of action to be taken, such as the limitation of armaments and improvement of international trade, follows the accepted lines which have guided the practice whose failure he criticises in the earlier part of his book. So far as the general argument is concerned, the book is an interesting commentary upon contemporary problems in international affairs. But the author is by no means a safe guide either in his philosophy of politics, or in his analysis of political forces. So far as philosophy is concerned, it may be

true that co-operation is natural and that the larger the scale of co-operation, the more effective it will become. But the moral value of co-operation entirely depends upon the purposes for which it is used. In his distinction between laws of nature and international law or civil law, the author gives a confused account of the power of custom. It is quite impossible to argue that any law which indicates what ought to happen, can be derived from observations of what does actually happen. The so-called "law" of gravitation has nothing to do with lack of freedom in stars and stones; nor does the moral prohibition of murder or the moral objection to war rest upon any observation of what is generally done. Indeed, the author neglects the existence and nature of what philosophers call "values". With regard to political analysis, the main weight of the argument is against all attempts and suggestions which have actually been made to improve the situation. But the author's anger is chiefly aroused by mistakes of the "Left". He spends much less time in describing the evils against which the advocates of peace have contended, than in criticising them for their defects. At the end of the book is a song of praise for Great Britain, which is presumably addressed to the British. The contrasts between nations are based, in the author's old manner, upon somewhat superficial differences in the social or political outlooks of the different nations. The British Empire is treated as a benevolent schoolmaster and nothing is said of the oppression which in fact has occurred in the history of British rule—for example in India and Ireland. Many of the passing remarks on the existing situation are acute and true; but the omissions are noticeable, as is also the general tendency to adopt a superior air towards those who are less educated or powerful than the present dominant caste in most nations.

C. DELISLE BURNS

Anthologie des Conteurs Estoniens—Choix fait par le P.E.N. Club Estonien. —Introduction by A. ORAS; Translated by B. VILDÉ, Mme. M. NAVI-BOVET, and R. BIRCK. (Sagittaire, Paris. 25 fr.)

La Jeune Fille Chez les Tigres (Feuilles de l'Inde, No. 5) : Légendes, Devinettes et Présages de la tribu des Hos. Selected by SUKUMAR HALDAR; adapted by ANDRÉE KARPELÈS. (Publications Chitra, Mouans-Sartoux, A. M., France, 15 fr.)

The historical landmarks of the races of mankind clearly show that though humanity is one huge spiritual family, its members differ in power of perception, development of consciousness and degree of evolution. Their lives, their reactions to environment and their actions make this more than evident. These two books serve as an excellent example of two extremes. While the Esthonian writers reflect a harsh and material tendency of mind, the Sontal shepherds of Bengal reveal through their simple legends profound springs of a poetic childlike nature both friendly and sweet. The Esthonians are rapidly advancing in all that spells success in Western civilization; they have abjured the spirit of the *Edda* in favour of crude realism. Their style is heavy. No spiritual aspiration, no vision of a better life, no uplifting of the soul and mind through ethical idealism lightens this collection of short stories.

The Sontals on the other hand have not fallen prey to these "civilizing" forces. They have kept the imagination and tenderness of a child-state they will not to lose. Each of these peoples strikes its characteristic note. From one comes the discord of violence and strife; from the other, songs which make no pretence either to great knowledge or to vast achievements. This simple folk's resting hours are consecrated rather to imaginative music and poetry. Their love of nature is happily tempered by a sense of humour. These Sontal tales do not, however, contain any of the telling philosophical or religious allegories so dear to the heart of lovers of the Indian folklore.

S. T.

Lifer. By JIM PHELAN. (Peter Davies, Ltd., London. 8*s*. 6*d*.)

Scattered throughout England and Wales are thirty-one prisons, each cut off from the public view by high grim walls, and each harbouring a secret, separate social existence of its own, quite unrelated to the life of the community outside. Each year some thirty or forty thousand men and women pass into these prisons, some to emerge after a few days, a few never to emerge again. What happens to these people? What effect do these places have upon the minds and spirits of their inmates? Many attempts have been made to answer, with varying success. But no one has yet supplied a more complete and convincing answer than Jim Phelan's. None has before told the whole story, in all its dim dearth and dread, with the veracity and artistry of *Lifer*.

Lifer is a novel. That is to say, it gives vivid, detailed pictures of two imaginary prisons seen through the eyes of an imaginary character serving a life-sentence. But seldom has fiction been more wholly informed with truth. The author adds nothing to, and takes nothing from, the facts of actual prison-life. He uses imagination only to rearrange the facts in a way that develops their vital implications to the full. He speaks with a rare authority. He has recently finished serving a sentence of fourteen years.

The story Mr. Phelan has to tell is starkly simple in outline. A youth is sentenced to imprisonment for life-duration. In prison he makes friends and enemies, plans an escape and funks it, broods through a grey blur of days, has a brief, illusory love-affair, assaults a warder, is classified as weak-minded, grows old and shambling and incoherent, and is released on licence at the age of thirty-six to return to prison after a fortnight at liberty. Other less definable things happen to him. He loses his courage, his self-reliance, his feeling. The saving curiosities—people, music, books—weaken and die within him; his awareness gradually narrows down to a few dim perceptions. Year by year, everything that is inessential to a prison-personality drops away from him, leaving only an inept mechanic thing barely reacting to bare situations, and quite unfitted to cope with the complexities of civil life. This is not what the penologists call "deterioration". It is the slow horrible history of a complex human being forced to re-integrate himself into an artificially bleak world. And it is brilliantly, faithfully described.

To read this novel is to invite a sick, shuddering horror that lingers for days after you have put the book down. Not to read it is to miss a rare spiritual experience. It stands head and shoulders above other books of its kind. If words have any power at all, *Lifer* should effect a lasting change in this country's penal system.

MARK BENNEY

Kanthapura. By RAJA RAO. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 7*s*. 6*d*.)

"It may have been told of an evening, when as the dusk falls, and through the sudden quiet, lights leap up in house after house, and stretching her bedding on the veranda, a grandmother might have told you, new-comer, the sad tale of her village." It is through the mouth of such an old woman that Mr. Raja Rao has chosen to tell his tale of how the peasants of a village in South India were won over for Gandhi's campaign of non-violence and moral force. It is a tale of the breaking down of caste-barriers and old prejudices, of heroic resistance to violent repression, and of the great spiritual awakening that came to millions of people in India under the leadership of the Mahatma.

Kanthapura is not a novel in the ordinary sense of the term, with definite characterisation, clearly worked-out plot and dramatic situations. Its material is rather the poetry of everyday life as it is still lived in almost any Indian village to-day. By casting his book in the idiom of that daily life and allowing his style to follow quite naturally the

thought-movement of his own people, instead of forcing it into alien and unnatural patterns, Raja Rao has achieved what can only be described as a minor epic.

In doing this he was faced, as he tells us in a Foreword, with the problem of conveying "in a language that is not one's own the spirit that is one's own". That he had succeeded in conveying this spirit would in itself have made *Kanthapura* memorable. But perhaps the most remarkable thing about his book is its detachment. In spite of the scenes of violence that fill many of its pages, the effect is one of tranquil wisdom and of a mind that has freed itself from all bitterness and hatred. It is this spirit that will give *Kanthapura* permanence when most of the political novels of our time have been forgotten, along with the bitterness and rancour of which they are the outcome.

PHILIP HENDERSON

To Become or Not To Become. By MRS. RHYS DAVIDS. (Luzac and Co., London. Board, 1*s.* 9*d.* Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*)

Does Buddhism preach self-annihilation or the realisation of the More in us which we already *are* potentially? Mrs. Rhys Davids holds that it preaches the latter. (pp. 3 and 134) Then how are we to reconcile with this teaching the tenets attributed to Buddhism, namely, atheism, non-existence of the Self (*Atman*), the momentariness of all existence, the goal of man as the destruction of himself who is nothing but a *samghāta* or aggregate of *dharmas*? These tenets, the author holds, are not the true and original teachings of Buddha. The truly central and fundamental idea of his teaching is that of Becoming or growth. (p. 26) The ideal of man is to become what he is potentially. Even according to Buddha God is immanent in man. (p. 134) Self-annihilation etc., were the ideals of the monastic order coming some time after Gautama. This Becoming does not exclude Being, but includes both Being and Nothing as in Hegel. (p. 8) The Sanscrit verb *bhū* means both to be and to become, whereas the verb *as* means simply to be. It is because of the peculiar meaning which the verb *bhū* had for the people of Buddha's time, that it was so often used with reference to man's ideal in life. Man must become, that is, grow. Because a static conception of reality influenced and guided the thought of the Indians who lived decades after Buddha, the important aspect of the meaning of *bhū*, the aspect of becoming, was ignored. Similarly the translator of Buddhistic works, who approaches them with the preconceived notion that, for Buddhism, man as static feels the heavy burden of existence and makes escape from it his ideal in life, translates them accordingly and gives a distorted picture of the teachings of Buddha. Is the exhortation to become more, the advice to realise the immanent Divine within us, fundamental or not to every religion? If it is, then Buddhism as a religion preached it. This conclusion is not the result of mere conjecture. If one keeps in mind the full significance of the word *bhū* and makes a critical study of Buddhistic works, disentangling the original teachings of Buddha from later interpolations and innovations (*cf.*, p. 9), one will be convinced that Buddha preached the doctrine of the Becoming More as much as any other founder of a world religion.

The book contains many other interesting topics connected with the meaning of *bhū*, but they cannot be dealt with here. Both the students and followers of Buddhism must be thankful to Mrs. Rhys Davids for her trying, here as well as in her other works, to bring this very important meaning of Buddha's teaching to the forefront.

P. T. RAJU

Four Ways of Philosophy. By IRWIN EDMAN. (Henry Holt and Company, New York.)

The substance of this book constituted the Henry Ward Beecher lectures delivered at Amherst College in 1936. The present reviewer has to confess straightaway that it makes very tantalising though very pleasant reading. The four ways the author distinguishes are logical faith, social criticism, mystical insight and the understanding of nature (and man's place therein). With logical faith that identifies itself with idealism, metaphysical or moral, he has little sympathy ; equally little sympathy has he with the Platonic type of social criticism which belittles the individual and dismisses democracy. The mystic vision, however, though generally allied with idealism, has greater attractions for our author. Wisely he says :—

> The reasonableness of reason itself remains undemonstrable. There is always lurking in a demonstration some immediacy unquestioned both at the beginning and the end. . . . Not only the heart but reason assents to more than it can find reasons for.

The author's real sympathies, however, are with the New Naturalism which "debunks" Idealism, holds that ideals are an escape mechanism, that "Goodness is the name men have summarily given to things and modes of living and persons they cherish and enjoy", that "Truth, Goodness and Beauty are not visitations or glints from an empyrean", and finds the justification for Religion in that "men seek peace even though they no longer hope to find it in a shining cosmos of Truth, Goodness and Being or God which may be proved in the face of disillusion and suffering, really and truly to be".

The author's style is brilliant, as will be seen from some examples chosen at random :—

> A bloody birth and a worm-infested grave bound the career of the most cogent dialectician.
>
> Sanitation is no enemy of the sublime.
>
> Heart-aches are not disposable by a five-year plan.

One cannot help feeling, however, that if the cogency of reasoning had equalled the brilliance of presentation, the result would have been very different. The element of greatest value in this book is the exposition of the view that the ideal and the actual are continuous. It is not possible to get to the former by turning one's back on the latter ; the higher values do not negate but fulfil the lower ; "cautions and prohibitions have their justification . . . in the interest of affirmation, of a life more abundant". The naturalism of Lucretius has its rough parallel in the Indian Charvaka ; and viewed in proper perspective, there is continuity between the Charvaka vision and that of the Vedanta seer ; the difference is that between more and less, not between positive and negative. This teaching of continuity, however, becomes meaningless with the naturalist treatment of ideals. Art and adultery are both natural, but they are not equally natural ; and the æsthetic quality of a production does not gain from its creator having passed through the Divorce Court or Reading Gaol. Even naturalism has to admit differences of degree. "Food is a good ; but gorging is an evil ; sexual enjoyment is a good, but nymphomania is a disease." Does not the evaluation necessarily imply a standard of reference, which is absolute, irrespective of diverse variation in the references and in those who refer ? The men who look for such standards may be unduly tender-minded ; but those who "seek peace" on Professor Edman's terms, how can they avoid being considered idiots, neither inspired nor inspiring ?

The fundamental defect of the book is the failure to think rigorously. It is true that "even reason assents to more than it can find reasons for", but is this to be understood as a suicide of reason, or as a fulfilment of reason which appears paradoxical to us since we have limited reason to demonstration ? If the latter alternative appears more acceptable, do we not pass therewith to a wider understanding of reason, which makes the identification of the real and the rational much more plausible than it otherwise seems ? We have conjured

up a stupendous physical universe (or multiverse), of which the earth is a tiny fragment; man is a tinier speck thereon; in his even more microscopic brain-box we locate reason and ridicule the attempts to equate it with the real. But surely in a much truer sense this entire multiverse is in reason; were it not, it could never have been imagined or comprehended. The philosopher who locates reason in the brain-box, how does he account for the extensive panorama of dream-experiences? Neither in waking nor in dreams does the world of experience get into our heads; but our heads as well as the "external" world find locations somewhere else; and that is the radiance of reason, *cidakasha*, which being itself spaceless finds space for everything else. Idealism may command our assent, while a frank naturalism with no mystic nonsense may evoke our sympathy. But when naturalism joins hands with mysticism, we have an unfortunate if not unnatural combination, which can neither exalt nor illumine, but only delude. It is for this reason that while admitting and admiring Professor Edman's gifts we have to deplore that he should have sacrificed them at the altar of cleverness in preference to cogency.

S. S. SURYANARAYANA SHASTRI

Dare We Look Ahead? By BERTRAND RUSSELL, VERNON BARTLETT, and others. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 5*s*.)

With the possible exception of Mr. Bartlett, the writers of these essays represent the intellectuals of the British Labour Party. Mr. Herbert Morrison, M.P., who writes on "Socialism To-day", is severely practical (he has had wide administrative and executive experience), and his test is "how far the nation is becoming the master of its own economic household". Mr. Bertrand Russell is convinced that "by diet and bio-chemical treatment a man's character can be completely transformed", and he affirms that "everything that has to do with values is outside the province of science." Mr. Bartlett does not believe that war is "round the corner", and Mr. G. D. H. Cole asserts that there is no criterion of economic rightness. Sir Stafford Cripps, K. C., M. P., believes that "the class struggle... is the most real and substantial factor in politics, national and international, to-day", and that the working-class have a "historic mission of world salvation". Mr. Harold Laski criticises those who identify their own way of living with the welfare of the nation as a whole, and thus, unconsciously perhaps, cuts away the ground from beneath the feet of his collaborators in their efforts to interpret world problems from the standpoint of the class struggle.

There is little, if any, evidence, in this volume that the authors are aware of the responsibility of scientific thinkers for the present depressing outlook of a power and machine age. Nor does it seem clear how they propose to build the world they desire upon a basis of conflicting self-interests without a violent revolution. Long ago Mr. Justice Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court, pointed out that "Success in a democratic undertaking must proceed from the individual", and that it is possible "only when the process of perfecting the individual is pursued". Here there is no metaphysic upon which the perfecting of the individual can be built, unless we admit the underlying assumption of the essays that economic processes are the determining factor in human evolution. To those who believe in the materialistic interpretation of history we would commend the wise words of Berkeley, the eighteenth-century philosopher:—

> Whatever the world thinks, he who hath not much meditated upon God, the human mind, and *summum bonum*, may possibly make a thriving earthworm, but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman.

B. P. HOWELL

ENDS AND SAYINGS

Below we print a few extracts (referred to in our editorial) arranged so as to give the reader a connected line of thought on the subject of the universal Law of Karma, the knowledge of which enables a man to use it for self-improvement and for the service of his fellow-men.

Karma is an Absolute and Eternal law in the World of manifestation ; and as there can only be one Absolute, as One eternal ever present Cause, believers in Karma cannot be regarded as Atheists or materialists—still less as fatalists : for Karma is one with the Unknowable, of which it is an aspect in its effects in the phenomenal world.—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, p. 305

An unerring law of Retribution, called KARMA, which asserts itself in a natural concatenation of causes and their unavoidable results.—*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 117

Everything which happens in nature is the result of necessity, and a law once operative will continue to so operate indefinitely until it is neutralized by an opposing law of equal potency.—*Isis Unveiled*, I, p. 420

As no cause remains without its due effect from greatest to least, from a cosmic disturbance down to the movement of your hand, and as like produces like, Karma is that unseen and unknown law *which adjusts wisely, intelligently and equitably* each effect to its cause, tracing the latter back to its producer.—*The Key to Theosophy*, p. 167

The effects of a cause are never limited to the boundaries of the cause, nor can the results of crime be confined to the offender and his victim. Every good as well as evil action has its effects, as palpably as the stone flung into calm water. —*ibid.*, p. 188

It is, in the strictest sense, " no respecter of persons ", though, on the other hand, it can neither be propitiated, nor turned aside by prayer.—*ibid.*, p. 165

Karma has never sought to destroy intellectual and individual liberty, like the God invented by the Monotheists. It has not involved its decrees in darkness purposely to perplex man ; nor shall it punish him who dares to scrutinise its mysteries.—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, p. 305

Evil and punishment are the agents of Karma, in an absolutely just retributive sense.—*ibid.*, II, p. 477

There is no Karma unless there is a being to make it or feel its effects. —*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 21*, p. 5

Karma creates nothing, nor does it design. It is man who plans and creates causes, and Karmic law adjusts the effects ; which adjustment is not an act, but universal harmony, tending ever to resume its original position, like a bough, which, bent down too forcibly, rebounds with corresponding vigour.—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, p. 305

Karma, broadly speaking, may be said to be the continuance of the nature of the act, and each act contains within itself the past and future.—*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 6*, p. 2

Karma is twofold, hidden and manifest : Karma is the man that is ; Karma is his action.—*ibid.*, p. 2

It is the mind as the basis of desire that initiates action on the various planes, and it is only through the mind that the effects of rest and action can be received. —*ibid.*, p. 5

Every act proceeds from the mind. Beyond the mind there is no action and therefore no Karma.—*ibid.*, p. 2

The LAW is Karma, reincarnation is only an incident. It is one of the means which the Law uses to bring us at last to the true light.—*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 21*, p. 3

The birth-seeking entity consisting of desires and tendencies, presses forward towards incarnation. It is governed in the selection of its scene of manifestation by the law of economy. ... It incarnates in those surroundings most in harmony with its Karmic tendencies. ... This governs ... in fact all those determining forces of physical existence which are ordinarily classed under the terms "heredity", and "national characteristics".—*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 6*, p. 3

How unphilosophical therefore it is to quarrel with our surroundings, and to desire to escape them? We only escape one kind to immediately fall into another.—*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 21*, p. 3

Every man is endowed with conscience and the power to use his life, whatever its form or circumstance, in the proper way, so as to extract from it all the good for himself and his fellows that his limitations of character will permit. It is his duty so to do, and as he neglects or obeys, so will be his subsequent *punishment* or *reward*.—*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 30*, p. 3

Measures taken by an Ego to repress tendency, eliminate defects, and to counteract by setting up different causes, will alter the sway of Karmic tendency and shorten its influence in accordance with the strength or weakness of the efforts expended in carrying out the measures adopted.—*U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 21*, pp. 7-8

Intimately, or rather indissolubly, connected with Karma, then, is the law of re-birth, or of the re-incarnation of the same spiritual individuality in a long, almost interminable, series of personalities. The latter are like the various costumes and characters played by the same actor, with each of which that actor identifies himself and is identified by the public, for the space of a few hours. The *inner*, or real man, who personates those characters, knows the whole time that he is Hamlet for the brief space of a few acts, which represent, however, on the plane of human illusion the whole life of Hamlet. And he knows that he was, the night before, King Lear, the transformation in his turn of the Othello of a still earlier preceding night; but the outer, visible character is supposed to be ignorant of the fact. In actual life that ignorance is, unfortunately, but too real. Nevertheless, the *permanent* individuality is fully aware of the fact, though, through the atrophy of the "spiritual" eye in the physical body, that knowledge is unable to impress itself on the consciousness of the false personality.

—*The Secret Doctrine*, II. *p.* 306

There is one eternal Law in nature, one that always tends to adjust contraries and to produce final harmony. It is owing to this law of spiritual development superseding the physical and purely intellectual, that mankind will become freed from its false gods, and find itself finally —SELF-REDEEMED.— *The Secret Doctrine*, II, p. 420

KARMA

THE TWIN DOCTRINE OF REINCARNATION
THE LAW OF ETHICAL CAUSATION, JUSTICE AND MERCY

Theosophic literature presents precise and complete knowledge on

KARMA

The Ocean of Theosophy, by W. Q. JUDGE, Chapter XI.
The Key to Theosophy, by H. P. BLAVATSKY, Section XI.
U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 6:—
Karma, by W. Q. JUDGE
U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 21:—
Overcoming Karma, by W. Q. JUDGE
U. L. T. Pamphlet No. 30:—
Karma—The Compensator, by W. Q. JUDGE

Some of the points considered in the above are:—
What is Karma—Is It a Being or a Law?
Is Karma Fate under another name?
Karma, the only explanation for all apparent evil and injustice in the world.
Three classes of Karma and Its three fields of operation.
Is Poverty bad Karma?

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, LOS ANGELES
THEOSOPHY COMPANY (INDIA), LTD., LONDON
AND
51, ESPLANADE ROAD, BOMBAY, INDIA.

READ

THE VISVA-BHARATI QUARTERLY

Founded by RABINDRANATH TAGORE.
Edited by K. R. KRIPALANI. (P. O. Santiniketan).

WHERE INDIA IS TRULY CREATIVE IN HER ART, LETTERS, PHILOSOPHY AND SCHOLARSHIP.

Extracts from Letters to the Editor.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru writes:
"I consider the Visva-Bharati Quarterly a journal of literary and artistic merit and I look forward to getting it."

The Marquess of Zetland writes:
"May I say how warmly you are to be congratulated on maintaining at so high a level the successive issues of the Visva-Bharati Quarterly?"

Mr. Ernest Rhys (Editor, Everyman's Library) writes:
"I should like to pay a very cordial critical tribute to the Visva-Bharati Quarterly, which seems to me the most original and vitally interesting of all our contemporary publications that deal with the arts and letters."

Mr. Havelock Ellis writes:
"Your Visva-Bharati Quarterly reaches a high level of literary quality and is full of varied interest."

Mr. Yone Noguchi (the celebrated Japanese poet) writes:
"One of the best magazines in the world."

Annual Subscription Rs. 8/–; Foreign 14s. (post free).

THE ARYAN PATH

The Aryan Path is the Noble Path of all times. The word "Aryan" is not used in its modern political, ethnological and anthropological sense. The Aryan Path stands for all that is noble in East and West alike, from the ancient times to modern days. It stands for the Ancient Way of spiritual development and growth in holiness, rooted in knowledge, and it can be walked by Brahmanas and Mlecchas, by Jews and Gentiles and by philanthropists of any political school.

CONTENTS FOR JUNE 1938

REINCARNATION
THE PATH OF SOULS—*By Merton S. Yewdale*
THE PROCESS OF REINCARNATION IN HINDU PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY—*By Mahendranath Sircar*
THE REASONABLENESS AND PRACTICALITY OF REINCARNATION—*By J. Middleton Murry*
REASON AND REINCARNATION—*By Raj Narain*
REINCARNATION IN THE ENGLISH NOVEL—*By Ph. D.*
SOME VEDIC TEXTS ON REINCARNATION—*By S. V. Viswanatha*
REINCARNATION AND KARMA —*By J. S. Collis*
I HAVE BEEN HERE BEFORE—*By Douglas Pope*
REINCARNATION—A HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL REVIEW—*By Marjorie Livingston*
A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION—REDEMPTION FROM SUFFERING AND SALVATION FROM SIN—*By Alban G. Widgery*
DHARMA RAJYA—FINANCE—*By H. Krishna Rao*
NEW BOOKS AND OLD—
A SOCIETY OF "SELFS"—PRE-EXISTENCE AND REINCARNATION—*By G. R. Malkani*
REVIEWS—*By B. P. Howell; Mahendranath Sircar; C. Delisle Burns; K. S. Shelvankar; Jack Common; Ph. D. and Keith Percy*
CORRESPONDENCE—PSYCHIC SCIENCE AND CRIME—*By Louis S. Vernon-Worsley*
ENDS & SAYINGS

TO APPEAR IN AUGUST AND AFTER

FEDERALISM IN THE UNTED STATES—*By James Truslow Adams*
DREAMS, AMORAL AND ETHICAL—*By Paul Bloomfield*
THE SUPREME STATE—*By John A. Osoinach*
THE MANDAEANS AND LIFE AFTER DEATH—*By E. S. Drower*
A GLIMPSE OF THE VEDIC WOMAN—*By Atulananda Chakrabarti*
THE UNREALISED SENSE—*By Jack Common*
TAO AND ITS GLOZES—*By Lawrence Durrell*
A DIALOGUE ON PHYSICALISM—*By Professor J. C. Gregory*

Per Annum—Rs. 6 India; 12s. Europe; $3 America.
Single Copy—As. 12 India; 1s. 6*d*. Europe; 35 cents America.

Printed by M. N. Kulkarni at the Karnatak Printing Press, Karnatak House, Chira Bazar, Bombay 2, and published by K. N. Panday, Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India.